An Analysis of UK and EU External Migration Control Governance and Mechanisms: Securitization, Manipulation and Cooperation

Amy Beth Manktelow

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the

requirements of Nottingham Trent University

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

First submitted 30th September 2016

Corrections completed 22nd August 2019

Abstract

This research analyses the relationship between the UK and the EU in context to external migration control. It has used a combination of Constructivism and Bourdieu to deconstruct the field of analysis and understand how an actor's behaviour can affect the structure of the external migration control field. Bourdieu was chosen to inform the theoretical framework as his field theory allowed a number of actors to be explored. It also recognises the importance of historical relationships impacting upon current interactions. Bourdieu explain these interactions as habitual or doxical. Habitual behaviours are learnt behaviours that adhere to the norms of the field. Doxical behaviours act against the norms and are used by actors, like the UK, to gain a higher status within the field and increase key capital. The three behaviours that have been explored are; securitization, manipulation and cooperation. In order to identify these behaviours policy documentation from key actors, like Frontex, have been qualitatively coded. The analysis uses three key moments in the history of the UK and the EU to guide the exploration of the data, these are; the Maastricht Treaty (1992), the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) and the UK Immigration Act 2014. The documentation chosen for analysis ranged from unilateral, bilateral and multilateral political agreements. Other documentation includes reports from associated actors that are part of the external migration control field. The documentation reveals the extent to which habitual behaviours dominate the relationship between the actors.

Acknowledgements

The journey to finishing this thesis has been immensely challenging but one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. I cannot express enough gratitude to those who have supported me. To Clare and Imad for nurturing me to achieve what they knew I could. To friends who believed in me when I did not believe in myself. To family that have always been my cheerleaders, especially my Mum and Dad. Lastly, to Bob who's never ending patience and love has seen me through the hardest moments.

Contents Page

Introduction

For Englishmen to boast of generation,

Cancels their knowledge and lampoons the nation.

A true-born Englishman's a contradiction,

In speech an irony, in fact a fiction.

Daniel Defoe

Human migration control is an issue that commands strong reactions from international actors at all levels of governance. An example of this is an increase in migrants from North Africa and the Middle East throughout the Arab Spring and the Syrian Civil War over the past decade. Industrialisation and globalisation have encouraged and facilitated the movement of millions of humans to seek employment and new opportunities in expanding cities across the world. The push factors of migration are, however, not always positive. Asylum seekers and refugees undertake journeys to avoid war or persecution. Human trafficking victims and smuggling victims often do not have a choice in their eventual destination or may not have chosen to leave their country of origin at all (Selm, 2005). As different as each migration story is, their movement is shadowed by a tangible structure designed to carefully control movement across international borders.

The EU was chosen as one of the key units of analysis in this research because of the complex structures it maintains. The control of migration was, and still is to some extent, the heart of the EU project, a way of enabling EU citizens to benefit from the states around them. The inspiration for this project came from a tenacious interest in the relationship between the UK and the EU. Since the earliest beginnings of negotiations to create a regional power, the relationship between the UK and the EU has been unpredictable. This unpredictability has come from outside influences, for example the Cold War, as well as internal disputes between member states. The UK has been afforded a special relationship with the EU from the beginning and what this research achieves is an insight into how this relationship is sustained through turbulent periods of history and great change in the political landscape of the region. More specifically it will investigate the periods of negotiation around the Maastricht Treaty (1992), the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) and the UK Immigration Bill (2014). The analysis goes no further than the enactment of the Immigration Bill on the 14th May 2014.

This topic was chosen as there is little to no literature that explores the complex relationship between the UK and the EU in relation to external migration control. What literature there is focuses on the securitizing mechanisms and behaviours of both actors. What exists in fact is a complex web of behaviours that contribute to the fractious relationship between the UK and the EU. Beyond the interest in the diplomatic and political makeup of the EU and its relationship with the UK there is a specific interest in the migration control mechanisms and structures that the two actors have created. It is one of the most debated issues that dominates discussion and negotiations between the two actors. Understanding the discussions around external migration control is key to understanding many of the other complex elements of the relationship. The development of external migration control policy from both actors over the past 70 years is a testament to the importance of migration as a political issue.

As the relationship between the UK and the EU becomes more tenuous this thesis is relevant as it exposes more complex behaviours beyond that of just securitization, allowing for a more thorough investigation into the relationship. The literature and analysis of external migration control has stagnated into a discussion of security rather than an exploration of other behaviours such as cooperation and manipulation which, is what this research focuses on. By exposing more complex relationships within and between actors we can begin to better understand how and why external migration control is so important for actors and how it shapes policy. The relevance of this topic is to better understand the UK as an actor within the field of the EU and external migration control. At times the UK can be a contradictory actor in relation to wider EU relations as well as more specifically external migration control. This research specifically examines the policies that control *external* migration control. This is migration from third country nationals that do not have the right to freedom of movement in the EU. Firstly, external migration control is distinctly different from internal migration control in the EU. This can be attributed to the normalization of internal movement and the frameworks which protect the rights of EU citizens. The movement of third country nationals is different as they are not afforded the same rights automatically upon gaining a visa. Secondly, external migration is treated more aggressively in terms of the controls created.

Politically to move beyond a narrative of negativity is extremely important. The media and societal perception of external migration is one of a security threat, which has been perpetuated by the political narrative, in which neither actor can come together to "control the threat". However, this research aims to dispel the myth that the field of external migration control is more than just a security driven field. This is relevant because the relationships in the field are a lot more complicated than that,

manipulation and cooperation are important elements in the relationship, in particular cooperation, especially as manipulation is considered a deviant behaviour. The societal perception of the EU by UK citizens could be altered if there was a wider understanding of how the two actors work together to control external migration. From another point of view it is also important to demonstrate that often the "threat" of external migration control is often over exaggerated by actors.

The progression of knowledge in relation to member state interactions when creating and maintaining external migration control structures was not the only inspiration to conduct the research. The UK and the EU use other associated actors and policies to control external migration such as Frontex and the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). This project will examine their function and gain insight into the subtler relationships within the EU. The importance of these mechanisms in maintaining or damaging the relationships of actors that take part in these structures is under-researched. This thesis will uncover how Frontex and the ENP are interesting units of analysis as they act as key actors in the external migration control field. Through the analysis of these actors you can disassemble the relationships between more dominant actors such as the UK and the EU, revealing the differing levels of governance which has informed the research question of this project.

Another interest is in the expansion of International Relations theory by using a unique theoretical framework. Current theoretical frameworks are unable to analyse the complexities of relationships around the topic of external migration in the EU and in particular how the UK manages its relationship with in that field. The use of Pierre Bourdieu (1986, 1991, 1996 and 2010) has been tentatively used by other IR scholars and this project highlights how his theoretical and methodological frameworks could progress the study of international relations (See Adler-Nissen (2012a and 2012b), Bigo (2000, 2002 and 2011) and Hamati-Ataya, (2012)). His theoretical framework considers the historical relationships between actors to explain current interactions, contextualising decisions that may seem out of place without the historical understanding. His work will be discussed in greater detail throughout the thesis. This thesis will, like Adler-Nissen (2012a and 2012b), seek to expand the boundaries of IR theory, however what this research achieves is a practical application of Bourdieu's themes and concepts.

The study of human migration, whether it be economic, illegal, clandestine, smuggling or trafficking and the controls which encourage, or limit movement have been the focus of many studies from varying disciplines for example Campesi, 2011, Hortsmann, 2014 and Geddes, 2000 and 2008. Some research centres on what drives people to move, others look at the impact migrants have on the economy (see Anderson 2001 & Czaika and Vargas-Silva 2012). Their projects range from longitudinal studies to the immediate impact on receiving states. Research also looks at governmental policy

towards migrants and how this impacts their movement. This research looks at all levels of governance, from local housing of asylum seekers, international student visas to voluntary removal of migrants who have overstayed. As vast as the research is on migration there are still areas of study where little research into how the creation and maintenance of migration control has affected the relationships of the actors that produce it.

The main aim of this research therefore is to understand the behaviours of the UK and the EU in relation to external migration control, specifically looking at the mechanisms at the EU's southern border, and how these behaviours effect the relationship of these actors. To achieve this aim, the research question for this thesis is: How does the UK engage with EU external migration control structures and how does this impact on its relationship with the EU?

The literature that is reviewed in the proceeding chapter informed the research question and aims of this research, especially the literature on the concepts of borders and securitization. The review of the literature begins with a discussion of classical IR theories and migration then explores the move into post-positivism, more specifically at the work of Constructivist thinkers such as Ole Wæver (1995) who began the academic conversation around securitization and migration. The discussion then moves on to literature that investigates the more specific concepts such as borders and the relationships between the different actors. Alongside literature that relates to the themes, there will also be a discussion of how this project fits in with existing IR literature that examines the international relations of migration. This thesis challenges the standard Constructivist approach to the securitization of migration which lacks the capacity to understand the complex web of relationships between the differing actors and how certain behaviours can change an actor's position in the field. Alongside the research question there is a qualitative coding framework to answer the aims of the research. The coding structure has allowed the research to examine many different types of policy documentation, including those from states as well at NGOs and EU control structures such as Frontex. The codes also helped to structure the way in which the data was approached as it allowed the data to be clearly recorded, as data that had a code was then marked to allow cross referencing between documents (Saldana, 2009). A full discussion and demonstration of the theoretical framework will be discussed in the Theory and Methodology chapters.

The Theory chapter will discuss the key IR theorists that have informed this research and how they will be adapted to answer the research questions to fill the gaps in the literature. The works of key theorists such as Buzan and Wæver (1993) will be deconstructed and placed within the context of this research as they were some of the first academics to study securitization and migration. This chapter also discusses the work of Bourdieu at length and how his framework of analysis has been modified

to fit within an IR theoretical context and how key elements of his theory have informed the Methodological approach. Theoretical texts from the field of security studies will also be discussed as these are important in informing and analysing the data especially as one of the core themes is securitization, such as Bigo (2000, 2002 and 2011). The Methodology chapter will then have an in-depth discussion into the data collection, handling and eventual analysis. There will be an illustration of the coding framework and how it was applied. The next chapter will be a historical insight into the construction of the field of migration control, using pre-1992 migration policies to illustrate how the relationship between the UK and the EU evolved from the Treaty of Rome (1957) onwards. The theoretical framework requires an understanding of the historical relationships between actors in the field as previous associations will affect the current structures of migration control. Decisions made at early negotiations for treaties such as Maastricht (1992) and the Dublin Convention (1997), that the UK and the EU took part in, have had an effect one the negotiation and actions of members of the field. An in depth understanding of the political impact of post war migrant recruitment and latter restrictions must therefore be examined.

The thesis will then be structured around the core concepts as identified by the data collection and analysis; securitization, manipulation and cooperation. These three chapters will house the analysis of the data outlined in the Methodology chapter. They will examine modern policies and treaties established by the UK and the EU after the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and how these treaties impacted upon the management of external migration control. As well as the treaties and policies themselves, special attention has been paid to the supporting documents such as parliamentary readings and communiques between Ministers in the UK and the EU commission. This is because they reveal more information than the finalised documents they support. The parliamentary readings demonstrate the opinions of MP's rather than the policy that defines the broad political consensus. Documents from Frontex are also best understood whilst using supporting documentation from both actors. The documents will be discussed in relation to the theoretical framework and assessing if the UK and the EU are demonstrating the behaviour that is being discussed in that chapter.

From Welcome Workers to Security Threat Chapter

The chapter titled *From Welcome Workers to Security Threat* will demonstrate the long history of external migration control in the UK and the EU. By looking at historical policy documents such as, the Immigration Act 1971, the chapter will show how policies like the Immigration Act has gone on to and continues to influence modern external migration control policy in the UK and in the EU. As well as this it demonstrates the awkward relationship between the UK and the EU has always been fractured, even from the UK entry into the EEC. However, it also demonstrates that UK and the EU have the

capacity to agree on policy explicitly as well as implicitly have the same goals in what policy should look like, creating a cooperative environment.

This chapter underpins the theoretical framework of the thesis. By illustrating the historical journeys of the key actors of the research, the UK and the EU, its shows how the field of external migration control has been established since the Treaty of Rome. This establishes how early relationships and the habitual behaviours of actors in the field have now become doxical, for example, the perception of the threat of the external migration. Without the understanding of this process it is challenging to establish why the UK has this very unique relationship with the EU. This chapter uses the Treaty of Rome as the starting point for the solidification of the field as it explicitly discusses the movement of people as a key areas for the EEC to manage. Whilst it was only a small part of the treaty and by no means demonstrates core policy, it does establish a field which has grown expeditiously over the past 60 years. The UK also may not have joined fully at this point, however was a signatory of the Treaty.

The chapter also illustrates that the joining of the UK to the then EEC was the beginnings of the UK attempting to gain a dominant position within the field of external migration control by gaining diplomatic capital and establishing itself as a loud voice within the EEC. It demonstrates that the UK mirrored the behaviour of those with the greatest power in the field of external migration control by restricting external migration and aligning itself with other actors in the field, such as, France and Germany. This chapter also establishes the external migration control mechanism, Frontex, as the "glue" which holds the field together, acting as a conduit between the actors of the external migration control field, allowing actors with lesser capital to gain power. In the case of the UK, they a perceptively less dominant as they are not part of the Schengen area, however they have been able to use Frontex as a key way of being able to gain more diplomatic capital within the field.

Securitization: The Habitus of External Migration Control

The securitization chapter is based around demonstrating the doxical behaviours that the external migration control field has. It also establishes how securitization became such a norm within the field, following on from the discussions in the previous chapter. This chapter delves into how external migration is perceived by actors in the field and how this is then used to justify what is often reactionary policy and behaviours that go beyond the actuality of the "threat" and even discusses if the threat ever existed at all. Threat perception is extremely important when discussing the field of external migration control as more often than not the perception is not the reality.

This chapter demonstrates how the UK uses securitization to gain advantage and diplomatic capital in the field. It also investigates how participation in mechanisms such as Frontex is following the doxical

norms of the field. It also investigates other mechanisms and policies such as the UK's 2014 Immigration Bill. It uses this piece of domestic policy to reflect the wider aims of the external migration control field. Following on from the policies conception right through until its royal assent, it illustrates how securitizing language was built into the law in line with wider securitizing mechanisms that were being created and maintained across the EU at the time.

This chapter also looks at how the stability of the field is essential for it to maintain its control over external migration. It will illustrate that stability allows for actors to gain more capital in the field as this would be difficult to do if they were always in conflict. This chapter also explores of the externalisation of external migration control exists but only as a habitual behaviour.

Manipulation: How Deviant is the UK?

The manipulation chapter explores how the behaviour of manipulation has shaped the external migration control field. It explores how manipulation allows for movement in the field and gaining of diplomatic capital, more specifically by the UK whose tenuous relationship with the EU has not always afforded it the best position in the field. For the UK manipulation is a learnt norm and behaviour which is has practiced since its relationship with the EU began in the 1970's. This chapter demonstrates how the UK's use of Frontex is not just about fulfilling obligations and can be described as manipulative as the UK gains are greater from its participation in Frontex than if it acted alone and especially when the high level of participation in Frontex is against the actual number of migrants entering the EU from outside of it. The chapter explores the idea that the UK's participation in Frontex is a securitization norm which allows for deviations elsewhere. These deviations are risky to the UK's position in the field however they are worth the risk as it allows for the UK to follow its own policy path as well as maintaining its position within the external migration control field and possibly even better it.

The chapter also demonstrates that changes, however big or small, to bilateral relations in the field could cause a ripple effect to becoming more doxical behaviours across the field. For example, the UK's bilateral agreement with Belgium regarding the Eurostar terminal could be the beginning of a trend of externalisation of migration across the EU. However, that chapter recognises that not all UK actions can be presupposed and that not all UK inactions with the field of external migration control can be viewed as manipulative. The chapter also looks at how manipulation can also favour other actors within the field and not just those who seek to gain more diplomatic capital. For example, EU can make financial gain from manipulation, for example, UK funding Frontex and its projects. From this the EU can maintain its dominant position with the field as well as no viewing the UK's manipulative behaviour as a threat to their dominance. Alongside these discussions there will be an exploration of how manipulative cooperation gives a stable field of external migration control. From

this we begin to explore the behaviours of cooperation and how actors in the external migration field are more likely to cooperate than anything else.

Cooperation: An EU Dream or Existing Reality?

Cooperation is not often a term attributed to the UK and the EU's relationship in context to external migration control. However, this thesis dedicates a whole chapter to the behaviour of Cooperation. In this chapter it is discussed that cooperation is key to stable field which is able to evolve. Constant conflict in a field will not allow new policies and mechanism to be created or for habitual behaviours to become doxical as there would always be a consistent move towards not adopting norms fully or even not adopting them at all. Throughout this chapter cooperation will be shown to be evident at all levels of governance across the external migration control field, from domestic to regional including all mechanisms of control. It is important to demonstrate how deep-seated cooperation within the field as it is against the narratives that are more widely recognised in the literature and in society. Within the chapter the dominant narrative of cooperation impacts on all relationships in the field, including those whose wish to remain dominant and those that wish to gain more diplomatic capital.

Whilst manipulation may demonstrate a move away from the doxical norms of the field, cooperation demonstrates established and adhered to doxical norms. These are important because disruptive or uncooperative behaviour can cause high instability in the field. This chapter analyses the mechanisms and policies which stabilise and perpetuate these norms and how the doxical behaviours are vital to the cooperation of all actions in the field. It also explores how each actor's position in the field dependent on depth and breadth of cooperation. The chapter explores that even the smallest examples of cooperation can demonstrate wider solidarity, for example helping out on a Frontex mission that does not even traditionally concern the UK. Beyond physical actions be it security or other examples the chapter also explores how data sharing between actors is also evidence of cooperation and not just an actor adhering to policy. Sharing of information can be a way of securing more diplomatic capital if you can be seen to be willing to cooperative with other actors in the field at all level of interaction.

This chapter further explores this by illustrating that if cooperation gives capital gains than an actor will adhere to the doxa. These capital gains maybe financial but diplomatic capital gains can be as powerful if it affords an actor, like the UK, a more dominant position in the field in which it can control the field more. The chapter also identifies the differences between active and passive cooperation in context to the external migration control field. It explores whether active or passive cooperation effects an actors place within the field as well as which of the two may damage the position of an actor in the field.

In the conclusion the research questions will be revisited to assess the extent they have been answered. Alongside concluding remarks in relation to the research aims and questions there will be a section dedicated to discussing the current crisis refugee crisis and the political challenges facing the UK and the EU since the referendum whereby the UK public chose to leave the EU. This discussion will explore the possibilities of applying the research frameworks of this thesis to the two situations and the future development of the theoretical framework.

Literature Review: Evaluating the Field

The literature on the subject of EU external migration control is varied, with little literature focusing on the specifics of the UK's relationship with the EU, in relation to the structures and controls of the field. This is attributed to the number of differing subject areas, such as International Relations European Studies, Cultural Studies, Politics that have researched the issue therefore a number of more specific concepts have been chosen in relation to the research framework. The first section of this chapter will discuss the existing IR literature in relation to human migration. The second section will explore the literature that exists on UK and EU migration policy, including how these policies effect the relationship between the two actors. The third section will be centred on the securitization literature as this is a core theme of the research. It will illustrate the need to look beyond the securitizing practice and explore other behaviours of actors. It will conclude with how this project is unique within the study of International Relations and human migration in Europe.

The Evolution of International Relations and Migration Literature

Prior to the mid-1980s, migration had been relatively ignored by IR and migration studies offered very little to the meta narratives. As Weiner (1985) suggests "literature on international relations says relatively little about population movements, except insofar as the refugee phenomenon is described as an outcome of conflicts" (Weiner, 1985, page 441). Until the mid-1980's Liberalism and Realism were the two leading paradigms and it was not until the breakdown of these main paradigms that IR began to tentatively approach international migration as a serious subfield of study. Out of these changes small pockets of IR literature began to emerge that moved the subject away from positivist thinking about state security, centred on military capabilities and economic dominance, to a post-positivist epistemology that attempted to understand the complex political landscape of the human migration management, in which issues of migration were problematized to include knowledge of areas such as humanitarian issues and environmental issues. A changed which mirrored other IR theories at the time such as Critical Theory and neo-Liberalism.

The creation of literature around this period time discusses the links between migration and international relations in reference to the rising number of illegal immigrants that were coming to Western Europe from the former Soviet Bloc during the collapse of the USSR. It also shadows the creation of the Schengen area and the securitization of migration policy throughout Europe in the mid-1980s. Weiner began to talk of migration in structural and political terms rather than a symptom of conflict. There are two elements of Weiner's article that are most engaging, these are his discussions

on the element of sovereignty when making decisions concerning migration, and how states have a direct effect on migration in terms of the entry and exit rulings of that state.

Weiner illustrates the conflicted interests that states and regions must balance, which is allowing migration and advocating the free trade principles and the free flow of capital, issues which are reflected within the EU. Weiner does highlight that even the most liberal of economic theorists would never encourage migration (Weiner, 1985). He likens migration to other modes of production in the economy, as something that needs to be controlled in order to get the most profit from it. If migration could be harnessed it could be a powerful mode of production for economies but Weiner also adds another factor into conflicting interests which is the sovereignty of a state. In hindsight, this research understands that the sovereignty of European states was about to change forever and the tensions this could bring, but Weiner manages to accurately predict the changes that the Schengen area would bring to Europe with ideas that can be correlated with the effects of the Maastricht treaty in 1992.

"The decision of the European Economic Community to permit citizens of member nations to move freely about represented a historic step toward the elimination of full member state sovereignty; it also represented a major step toward the redefinition and an enlargement of national identities to encompass a European nationality."

Weiner, 1985, page 443

The passing of a small amount of sovereignty to the EU level also means the re-bordering of national boundaries not in a literal sense but in a diplomatic sense. This in turn changing the engagement of member states such as the UK. The re-ordering of national borders, as Weiner describes, begins to incorporate a European nationality, something which is often termed Europeanization (Headley, 2008). The effect upon migration is that changes to sovereignty and borders, changes and indeed challenges the flow of migration. Instead of migrants facing the bureaucracy of a single state, immigrants to Europe now face a European system, a multifaceted governance of the border. This also changes how member states such as the UK engage with structures and mechanisms, however this is left out of the early narratives of migration literature. It is very important to understand how changes to sovereignty rebalance the field of external migration control as it has an effect on the relations between actors in that field.

Mitchell (1989), unlike Weiner, is more concerned with international political economy and foreign policy of migration and his argument is based heavily on the US model of migration policy towards Mexico. Much like Weiner, Mitchell reflects on the lack of scholarly writing from an IR perspective in context to migration and firstly reflects upon IR scholars that have made step towards theorizing

international migration. He assesses the functions of the nation-state and foreign policy and how it effects international migration and relations between states, which is a step forward to understanding how changes in international structures impact on the relationships of the external migration control field. He loosely uses the World Systems Theory (Wallerstein, 2004) to assess the relationships that 'core' states have with 'peripheral' migration sending states. He argues that "Interstate migration dealings in the Western Hemisphere, one may note to underscore the value of interregional comparisons, are in some ways coming to resemble West Europe's relations with its migration 'periphery'" (Mitchell, 1989, page 702). What Mitchell is claiming is that all across the world international relations effects migration in numerous ways for example the volume of migrants, the type of migrants and whether or not they are illegal or legal. He stresses the European bilateral links with sending states after World War Two, for example France and Algeria, demonstrate the relationship between the powerful receiving states who effectively use less developed sending states to receive the migrants that 'fit' the profile of what that particular state or regions wants and needs. However, what Mitchell does not achieve is an insight into how these bilateral links effect wider relations within the field, his argument is simply an extension of the world systems model.

Hollifield (1992 and Bretnell and Hollifield, 2008) examines the varying theories of IR and their reaction and commentary of migration. He also asks the question: "How much conflict and cooperation in international relations have resulted in (or will result) from recent waves of migration?" (Hollifield, 1992, page 592). The collapse of the Soviet Union, the Gulf War and the signing of the Maastricht Treaty (1992) are all examples of conflict and cooperation which had direct effects on the movement of people across international borders. The collapse of the Soviet Union had an especially large impact on migration with the level of migrants from Eastern Europe rising sharply. Relations between North Africa and Europe have always affected the flows of migrants from the Mediterranean region. Such as the Algerian War of Independence saw a peak of Algerian migrants travelling to France to resettle with family members (House, 2006). An example of cooperation is the creation of the EU and how previous emigration states such as Spain, Portugal and Italy have become immigration states (Koikkalainen, 2011). The recognition of actor's behaviour on their decision making towards external migration structures and mechanisms supports this research.

Hollifield develops his arguments further along the line of migration and regional interdependence in Europe. He refers to the regional management of migration in Europe as a "weak international regime" (Hollifield, 1992). In hindsight we can now witness the securitization and criminalization of migrants within the EU as a large step towards a stronger international regime, changing the attitudes to external migration control and mechanisms. However, the same struggle for a region wide migration policy effects the relations that the EU has between member states, including the UK, and

its neighbours, instead the EU is opting for more strategic practices such as Frontex and the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). Hollifield concludes that migration needs to be considered in both political and economic terms. A gap in the literature has formed, whereby the regional politics of securitization has been examined however it lacks the knowledge of how the external migration control structures directly affects its relationships with member states, namely the UK.

There is literature that explores the UK's relationship with external migration controls in relation to the EU. Vollmer (2014), for example, analyses historical domestic policies and recognises the impact of regional structures on the formation of policy within a domestic setting but does not go the step further and then reflect on how the effects the wider field. Marsh (2001) examines the globalisation of power, or more specifically the movement of power from "Whitehall and Westminster to Brussels" (page 209). Whilst the text is not exclusively regarding external migration controls and mechanisms, it does explore the Home Office's relationship with the EU, in regards to migration more generally. He discusses the ambivalence of the UK to engaging with wider structures of EU policy making, however offers little insight into how this ambivalence actually impacts upon the UK's relationship with the EU over external structures and or how it has directly impacted upon decisions made by either actor in the field.

Somerville (2007) in his book titled *Immigration under New Labour* is a more detailed account of how the UK under Labour government in the early to mid-2000s managed all areas of migration. It is the closest the literature has come in achieving what this research achieves which is a detailed discussion on how the UK policies decision making effects it relationship in the external migration control field. Somerville discusses how the UK has continually been opposed to wider regional controls, led by the EU, and any cooperation was done solely to ensure the EU supported the UK on other initiatives (Somerville, 2007). However, he does recognise that the UK is willing to work alongside other member states on an operational level to curb unauthorised migration. Furthermore, he discusses the lack of competence at a regional level to manage external migration control which has effected the UK's willingness to work alongside EU (Somerville, 2007). What Somerville lacks is a theoretical understanding of actions taken by the UK that are embedded in the historical context of the relationship between the two actors.

Overall the literature surrounding international relations and migration is limited in its scope and analysis. Although the likes of Weiner sort to expand the relationship between the two academic fields but little progress has been made to complete the task he started. The problem lies in the lack of emphasis put on inter-EU relations and how this effects the wider regional relationships. Whilst Hollifield seeks to engage more laterally in the discussion regarding migration and IR it still lacks a

specificity in the rhetoric regarding member states, such as the UK, and how external migration influences the behaviours between actors and how it can cause imbalances in the field. The imbalances in the field cause unstable relations and particular actors could deviate from the norms. However, this is not reflected in the literature, even when you look at authors such as Vollmer (2014), Marsh (2001) and Somerville (2007), who discuss the UK and its relationship with the EU at length, however, do not seek to understand the influence of historically influenced norms in the UK decision making.

Assessments of European Migration Policy

The next section focuses on literature that explores European Migration Policy, which includes how this effects its relationships with other actors in the field. As the most dominant actor in the field it is important to understand how the EU manages its behaviour through the structures and mechanisms it produces and how these actions and behaviours have a wider impact in the field.

At the beginning of the 1990's as the European Economic Community (EEC) evolved into the EU, the literature began to engage with the different mechanisms of migration control. One of the strongest rhetoric's is the external migration policy and/or strategy literature which centred on the concept of Fortress Europe. The idea of Fortress Europe is often discussed in two differing ways; first it is seen as keeping unwanted aliens from entering the union and the second rhetoric is based within economics. Economic academics and commentators discuss whether the EU alienated other economies from trading with them because member states became too interested in their own development rather than seeking relationships outside of the European Economic Area (EEA) (see Aho, 1994, Patterson, 1992 and Linder, 1992). This thesis will look at the former and is a theme that will be developed throughout this thesis through the themes of securitization, manipulation and cooperation. This part of the chapter will be split into two discussions; the first will be a look at the broader sense of fortifying using the USA/Mexican border as a comparison to the European model. The second part will use more European specific literature to explain particular policy and strategy and their relation to 'Fortress Europe'.

One of the most interesting ways in which to explore the theme of 'Fortress Europe' is to compare it with other similar areas, which have stringent border controls. The easiest comparison is the American border with Mexico. The USA is attempting to build a fortress at its southern border much like the EU, as the USA is experiencing demographic deficits alongside the USA's informal economy. There are also particular industries, such as domestic services, that rely on cheap and relatively quick turn over of immigrants (legal or illegal), which is reflected also in Southern Europe within agricultural industries in particular. The USA has also experienced a constant rise in illegal immigrant numbers even with

extremely stringent migration policy with immigrants that are willing to go to extreme lengths to enter the USA. Cho (2010) discusses the management of borders at a federal, state and local level. The disparities in the different levels of legislation are reminiscent of the many institutions of Europe with multifaceted governance through multiple actors for example the UK Immigration Bill (2014) introducing immigrant status checks to rent a property or open a bank account alongside the large controls such as the UK Visa and Immigration services (UKVI). It means that controls do not necessarily have to be at the external borders but the general mind set of the entire region, its states and its citizens. Cho's recognition of the different levels of governance reflects the investigations of this research insofar as analysing how the maintenance of different borders effects the relationships of the field of external migration control (2010).

Similarly, Ruiz (2006) argues that it is evident that fortification is very relevant to modern day Europe by the structures that have been built post-Maastricht treaty as well as ongoing border disputes between the USA and Mexico. One of the clearest comparisons that can be made is the status of Mexico not only being a country of origin for migrants but as a country of transit as well. "[Mexico] serves as a region of transit for others who have left their homes in other part of Latin America as well as the rest of the world" (Ruiz, 2006, page 47). The effects on national security relate to the building of walls around a territory, whether that is a single state or an entire region. The threat of not only citizens from the neighbouring states but also the citizens of other states is of concern to policy makers as they represent a form of social or cultural threat. The similar situation in Europe is how North Africa serves as a transit region for so many, with migrants coming from Asia, the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa (Baldwin-Edwards, 2006). This has been especially highlighted in recent times with the Arab Spring causing such unrest in the region. In the summer of 2011, France and Germany suspended the Schengen agreement after Italy handed refugees visas that would allow them to travel around Europe freely (see Bialesiewicz 2011). The panic that ensued highlighted the negative perception of migrants by policymakers at all levels of governance is continuing in Europe that has been historically established since the Treaty of Rome (1957). But it is not only the effects or fear of security breaches that make a nation, or in the EU case, a region that will close doors to immigration. Issues of welfare management, economy and integration are fast becoming the 'buzz' words used by politicians and the media to explain the building of such symbolically high walls to stop immigration from entering the EU territory, in particular the UK. What Ruiz's paper highlights is the idea of fortifying Europe being not always as simple as seeing an outsider as an enemy that needs to be kept out. It demonstrates that border building by different actors is often not a physical act of building a wall but is symbolic act of defending key social and cultural norms that are historically recognised, then perpetuated throughout the field of external migration control.

Martin (1999) raised 'Fortress Europe' out of being purely a metaphorical discussion to a theoretical framework to understand the bordering practice of European states. The theory of Martin's study is based in Immanuel Wallenstein's World Systems Theory (2004) and it explores and critically assesses the changes in the world system after the Cold War, how these changes have greatly affected migration policy within the European context and how these changes have seen adverse effects to developing states, particularly those that border the EU. Martin examines how the changing politics and economics in the early 1990's onwards has changed the push and pull factors for migrants. He suggests:

"A peripheral state's proximity to the geographic orbits of these formations, or of economic and/or strategic interest to a principal core state may induce or increase massive and illegal immigration into the metropoles of the bloc".

Martin, 1999, page 824

The sentiment behind the creation of an 'island' or 'fortress' that has a negative effect to those that live on the periphery of it resonates throughout 'Fortress Europe' literature. Martin does touch upon how there is an irony that third world immigrants are denied entry into Europe when in fact it was often at developing states expense that the EU were capable of building such a lustrous fortress (Martin, 1999). Actors at the peripheries of the external migration control field are often manipulated by other actors with more capital who seek to use less developed actors, for example the negotiations by the EU to expand migration controls into North Africa through the ENP. Martin's observations fit well with the theoretical framework insofar as analysing actors attempting to gain a better position in the field by adhering to the doxical norms.

Ireland (1991) explores the unprecedented changes that reshaped the EU forever, his discussion centres on the impact of immigration on creating a more politically ambitious European project. "Central to both the economic and social dimensions of the 1992 project has been Western Europe's 13 million immigrants… [and] the entry of legal and illegal migrants" (Ireland: 1991: 457). Ireland examines how migrants where not only facing a fortress at the external boundaries of the EU but also within the receiving societies themselves. They are also not necessarily societal barriers but political parties that wish to stem the flow of immigration, be it illegal or not. Ireland also illustrates that integration of member states is more difficult when migration looms over any discussions and meetings. His discussions supporting the idea of this research that the doxical behaviours of the EU are ingrained into all areas of the external migration control field including that of UK domestic immigration policy. The case studies may be dated but the core concepts discussed are mirrored through current debates about the possibility of accession of states such as Turkey. Ireland's work

mirrors this research insofar as he demonstrates the complexities of multi-level external migration governance in the EU and how doxical and habitual behaviours effect the creation and management of mechanisms and structures, what his argument lacks is the historical understanding of the relationship between actors in the field and the implication this has on the field of external migration control.

Geddes (2000) explores how European integration and policymaking has made migration a central issue for the EU. The core argument of the book is how migration is inherently central to its integration. "The reshaping of European migration policy and politics by European integration emphasises migration's centrality to European integration" (Geddes, 2000, page 171). This is a key theme that pulls the elements of securitization and cooperation together because of the impact of historical migrations on the modern integration of EU member states and how the external migration field is managed. This research will develop this argument by analysing the different behaviours that present themselves as integration in the field; securitization, manipulation and cooperation. Geddes' study shows how conscious the EU and researchers alike are aware of how policy building can also affect how the fortress is built or in relation to this research how the field is built and maintained. What this thesis develops is how the UK is aware of their behaviour and by using the data, identifying what behaviour is learnt norms and what his habitual capital building behaviours.

Geddes also uses elements of World Systems Theory like Martin (1999) to explain the core/peripheral relationships in European migration management. Like Martin, Geddes explains how core European states create policy that benefits them and policies towards other regions or states are less favourable. What Geddes develops are the links between the creation of migration policy and the widening of the gap between core and peripheral areas by using the Maastricht Treaty as a way of illustrating how migration policy constructs the wall around the EU. "The post-Maastricht elaboration of immigration policy co-operation left little room for the kinds of supranational constitutionalism and institutionalism that have been significant for free movement" (Geddes, 2000, page 108). This shows a significant change in the attitudes towards immigration from outside the EU, consolidating the doxa of securitization further. During the 1980's the focus was on the opening of internal EU borders and the Maastricht treaty was the turn around to a more aggressive policy towards extra-EU migration. It was what Geddes coins a 'reconfiguration' of policy on a monumental scale (Geddes, 2000). The idea of reconfiguration of policy having a direct impact upon attitudes that Geddes alludes to mirrors that of this research. Instead of interpreting it simply as a reconfiguration this thesis develops the reconfiguration concept and understands the negotiation period of the 1980's as a time of norm building through the reconfiguration of political structures and of the field.

Immigration and European Integration; Beyond Fortress Europe? (2nd edition, 2008) fully develops the ideas that Geddes put forward in the first edition, particularly in context to the Amsterdam Treaty (1997). The first edition was written and published when the Amsterdam Treaty had not been fully ratified by all member states. The Amsterdam Treaty became extremely important as it consolidated the earlier Maastricht Treaty into law and was the first European treaty that faced a newly independent Eastern bloc, which is why it was chosen as a key juncture to analyse. Geddes (2008) constructs the idea that it "intensified EU action" towards migration. The treaty opened the discussion on external border management, the politics of migration and the integration of foreign nationals within the boundaries of the EU. How this research will differ to that of Geddes is that instead of putting forward the idea that whilst the Amsterdam Treaty appears to have opened borders, it in fact consolidated the doxa of the external migration control field, cementing the need to securitize external borders as well as demonstrating how the UK adheres to the rules of the game.

The concept of 'Fortress Europe' and policy is often discussed within the discipline of Law and these studies offer interesting opinions about this theme. Papastavridis (2010) offers an analysis of Frontex, which as heavily featured in the migration strategy for the external migration control field. The main theme throughout is that the EU has an increasing need and want to protect its southern borders by any means possible. The most interesting idea which will be elaborated on in much further detail later in the thesis, is that Frontex is the closest the EU has got to region wide cooperation but under the surface the cooperation between states is never as it seems. "These [Frontex] operations are based on a novel concept sometimes called 'compulsory solidarity'" (Papastavridis, 2010, page 78). The idea of 'compulsory solidarity' is an interesting concept as it has similarities with the Bourdieusian concept of norm building and that doxical behaviour impacts upon the actions of actors in the field. This research will expand upon the idea that many EU states will act cooperatively merely on the basis that it is expected of them rather than because they want to.

Castles and Miller (2003) opened the dialogue concerning how migrants affect the economy of their receiving states and regions. Instead of being region specific the chapter is an overarching study into how migrants affect the economy and vice versa. Castles and Miller also describe the advances in researching migration and economy in the USA and Australia but explain how in Europe such studies are still in relative infancy. "The economic restructuring since the 1970s has given rise to new immigration flows and new patterns of immigrant employment" (Castles and Miller, 2003, page 194). Castles and Miller recognise that key points in European political history have a profound impact on current structures. This is the main theme that will be present in this thesis and is supported by Bourdieu who discusses the importance of history in the norm building practices of actors (Field, 2003). The turning point for the norm building practices of the EU in context to external migration

control did not begin with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. It existed throughout the global economic recession of 1973-75 which is why it is imperative to understand where modern practices and mechanisms have originated.

Bialasiewicz (2009, 2011 and 2012) illustrates the EU member states lack of cooperation when it comes to immigration cross the EU external border. The article is more of a commentary of recent trends in immigration to the EU post Arab Spring, but uncovers the underlying geopolitical importance of borders for the EU and highlights the complications that the field has when approaching issues that could cause structural changes. Bialasiewicz discusses how although the EU attempts to act as a single political bloc and suggests that when the issue of border control arises; national interests still outweigh the regional. "'National' solutions that came to the fore, as a number of Member States decided to suspend the Schengen agreement" (Bialasiewicz, 2011, page 299). What Bialasiewicz highlights is that states will still act nationalistically if the influx of migrants potentially affects the security of their border. This highlights one of the main themes of the thesis, the member states are reluctant about whether to produce regional migration policy which in turn will affect how the external migration control field is managed. The article highlights the need to analyse actor's reactions and behaviour to external changes to the field as changes can influence controls and mechanism beyond just the control of borders.

Sassen (1999) resonates with a core idea of this research insofar as the politicisation of immigration from outside the European bloc began long before the creation of the EU. What Sassen manages to achieve is a historical perspective which is so often lacking from 'Fortress Europe' literature and migration literature alike.

"It is essential that Europe shed its image and representation as a continent whose migration history is confined to the mass emigrations of the past. This is a partial account to the point of distortion, and it is hampering the achievement of reasonable policy."

Sassen, 1999, page 157

The author of this thesis agrees that the EU and its member states can no longer create reactionary migration policy that is ahistorical. The research that Sassen has undertaken in this book is impactful and will be a foundation for this thesis to contribute more knowledge to this area. Sassen achieves what many other writers fail to; a critical analysis of migration policy rather than a chronological list of historical events. The book encourages the reader to critically assess the knowledge that you may currently have about migration in Europe and illustrate to researchers like me that it is possible to

take elements of a number of disciplines and make them your own without falling into the trap of creating a purely empirical piece of work which this thesis will emulate.

Security and Migration Literature: Identifying the Gaps in a Busy Field

Security and migration are two themes that are inexplicably linked. When discussing security in modern terms you must first define what element of security you are discussing. Within International Relations there are many facets of security such as human security, environmental security and border/territorial security. Security in context to migration discusses the idea of welfare security and the protection of identity as well as border and territory security. In the case of the EU this is a shared identity between being a European citizen and a national citizen. For the EU, security is an extremely important issue as without it integration between member states would be nearly impossible. Europe had been at war within its own borders for hundreds of years and the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) laid the foundation for regional security. With the creation of the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) policy, in 1992, member states consolidated a small amount of national sovereignty to protect the security of the region (Lindstrom, 2005). Following on from the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty (1992) the trend between EU member states is to build more regional security, especially since the implementation of the Schengen agreement. Although many fear that EU security is now being breached by a different sort of enemy, the immigrant. Within the literature surrounding this issue the biggest security threat that immigrants face is against European/National identity (for some the latter is more important than the former), welfare security and post 9/11 have seen migrants be raised to the status of terrorist. Migration is seen as so much of a threat that it on the Eurobarometer it is seen as more of a threat to Europe than terrorism (Boer, 2008). When researching security and borders you have to acknowledge the difference between security and securitization. Security is the physical actions of a state or individual to protect themselves, securitization however refers to the policy and diplomatic actions of a state and individual. Both acts are evident in the relationship between the UK and the EU in relation to external migration and the literature surrounding these concepts will now be explored in greater depth.

The first academic that opened the security discourse in relation to migration within the context of the European Union was Jef Huysmans. In December 2000 the article *The European Union and the Securitization of Migration* (2000) was published and opened the argument for the securitization of migration. Huysmans starts his debate with the idea that structural changes within the EU are to blame for the growing security culture that now surrounds migration. These changes appear in the introduction of the Third Pillar of Justice and Home Affairs, the Schengen Agreements and the Dublin Convention (Huysmans, 2000). The article is an in-depth look at how these institutional changes

alongside political changes throughout the EU and its member states, beginning with the initial influx of post-World War Two migrants. One admission by Huysmans is that it is difficult to generalise about migration policies in the post war period. Each state managed their migration policy differently, but one common theme is that the super states of Europe such as France and Germany used guest worker policies to gain in economic terms with little thought about migration in terms of security. Huysmans outlines an example of this; "Their legal status was not of relevance to domestic needs. If anything, their illegality contributed to making them even more flexible and exploitable" (Huysmans, 2000, page 754). Huysmans then goes on to describe how the securitization of migration began to occur with the politicisation of migration in the 1970's, even more so with the development of the Schengen agreements in the mid 1980's. Huysmans also illustrates the securitization of migration steadily began with the integration and expansion of the community and that "security discourses and technologies penetrated the Europeanization of migration policy" (Huysmans, 2000, page 756). Like many of the contributions to migration literature Huysmans makes the link between the depletion of internal borders having a direct link to the strengthening of the EU's external borders. This is viewed as a security issue for a number of member states, especially the UK who already pushes the doxical boundaries of the external migration control field.

The unique element of Huysmans' research is the illustration of the idea that there are defining practices that institutions adopt that have added to the securitization of migration. "In security practices the political and social identification of a community and its ways of life develop in response to an existential threat" (Huysmans, 2000, page 757). What Huysmans has established is that the EU has built more of a community and integrated as a whole because of its fear of the 'other', of migrants. On a negative point Huysmans argument does lack some ground insofar as it does not tackle the discourse that the EU has never integrated its human migration policy.

Arguments such as Huysmans have been developed further by Adamson (2006). Some academics have only engaged with the idea of securitization and migration since 9/11 but Adamson advocates that securitization of migration began in the 1990's (Adamson, 2006). This is a theme that will be addressed throughout this thesis. Migration has seen a rise in securitization since 9/11 but the political and institutional changes towards securitization began long before 9/11 in the field of external migration control. This concept within the literature of will be supported by the argument that securitization became a doxical norm from the earliest conceptions of the EU. Adamson's article is not region specific, it looks at both the EU and the USA and draws parallels between the two regions. Like Huysmans, Adamson explores the idea that the shift towards the securing of migration began with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the eastward enlargement of the EU. How Adamson differs is the

shift from the security issue being a uniquely Eastern European problem to viewing migration from the south of the EU's borders as a higher security risk. As Adamson highlights;

"Since the September 11 terrorist attacks, questions relating to migration and security are increasingly viewed through the lens of international terrorism. This is true not just in the United States but also in Europe."

Adamson, 2006, page 195

Other terrorist attacks in Madrid and London (although the London bombings where a year after the publication of this article) emphasised the security risk of migrants. A situation that is different to that of the USA who is more at risk of external infiltrators, the EU has been targeted from sleeper cells from inside state borders a factor that has been recognised at the EU level. This has effected the securitization of migration and in some cases, such as the UK, accelerated domestic policy changes. Migration from North Africa has been seen as a higher security risk than Eastern European migrants on the basis that migrants from North Africa tend to be Muslim and a growing 'domestic mobilization around radical Islam' (Adamson, 2006) has seen the construction of a negative policy structure in the UK and the EU, causing actors like the UK to deviate from the doxical structures set out by the external migration control field. This thesis investigates how these deviations effect the field.

The body of literature surrounding the securitization of migration is large and there are many who support the discussion of 9/11 being a catalyst for the securitization of migration, however, there are those that believe that events such as 9/11 have done little to enhance the links between security policy and migration policy. Boswell (2007) explores how other political interests and structural changes in European institutions and shaped migration policy over the past ten years. Boswell explains that policy areas and organisations do not mix as freely as some studies would have you think; "Even where there appears to be evidence of one policy area colonizing another, organizations may display a surprising degree of robustness in resisting change" (Boswell, 2007, page 607). Boswell's main concept supports this thesis insofar as actors of the external migration control field will exhibit different behaviours and opinions towards migration control structures and mechanisms.

Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe (1993) is written by scholars from the Copenhagen School of Security Studies Ole Wæver, Barry Buzan, Morten Kelstrup and Pierre Lemaitre. They argue that migration affects the social security of a state and the natural rhythms of migration and how migrants will often move from an area of perceived high security to an area of low security (Wæver et al, 1993). It is highlighted that the areas of high security do not necessarily have to be violent or war torn areas but areas where there is social and economic insecurity. Wæver et al support

this researches argument that migration gradually became an issue throughout the latter part of the twentieth century. "[Migration] challenges the ability of states to control their borders, traditionally regarded as a fundamental attribute of sovereignty" (Wæver et al, 1993, page 149). They highlight the important fact that states are under full control of their borders and can close them if they so wish, but more importantly the securitization of migration occurs because of more political issues of economics, social and moral issues surrounding the admittance of migrants.

Wæver et al (1993) focus on state level interactions, however their work points towards how the growing economic integration in the early nineties would lead to rising international migration as capitalist, developed states became beacons for migrants. As Wæver et al argue; "International migration is thus a collective phenomenon which arises as part of the social relations between the less developed and more developed parts of the global economy" (Wæver et al, 1993, page 150). The developments that have occurred after the publication of this text support this argument for example the Maastricht Treaty and the creation of the Third Pillar. From a securitization perspective the authors maintain that large scale migration that was occurring during this time effected major changes in the social security of states across the developed world. When you take into account 9/11 and similar terrorist attacks at the beginning of the twenty first century migration transcended from a social security problem to a regional, and in the case of Europe, a national security problem. What makes this research unique is taking the relationship between the multiple actors of the external migration control field and understanding how the securitization of migration can be analysed alongside other behaviours and how those behaviours can challenge the field. Wæver et al (1993) are a solid foundation to build an argument upon as this research will take the importance of state territory and transcend it to the regional level. It will argue that regional territory is now as important as the territory of a single state and regional institutions due to the norm building practices of the EU and the continued relations between actors in the field.

An article which modernises Wæver and the Copenhagen School's theories is P. E. O'Neill in his study *The European Union and Migration: Security versus Identity* (2006). In the first paragraph O'Neill uses Rothschild (1995) to summarise that the post-Cold War global security agenda has changed in these four ways;

"Downwards, from state level to groups and individuals; upwards, from state level to trans- and supra- national systems; horizontally, from military to other forms of security; and outwards, where responsibility for invigilating these 'concepts of security' is dispersed from states to international institutions such as the European Union (EU), local government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and even public opinion and the press."

Rothschild, 1995, page 55

O'Neill uses these four changes to assess how migration has shifted the EU security agenda and how this can be seen through the creation and implementation of both the ENP and the common visa and asylum system (Schengen). He offers a streamlined definition of security that is often missing from securitization literature: "Security is principally concerned with freedom from threat, thus, whatever constitutes a threat is, de facto, a security issue" (O'Neill, 2006, page 324). Therefore, human migration is perceived as a threat politically, economically and socially for the EU as a whole and its member states. It goes some way to explaining the gradual securitization of migration throughout the region because migration was only deemed a threat when larger security threats had diminished. As O'Neill argues since the end of World War Two, Europe has had other security threats such as post-war instability and the threat of the Soviet Union up until the early nineties. This supports the argument that migration has always been seen as a threat but only in the past twenty years as the level of threat been unprecedented. It authenticates the aim of this research to prove that the behaviour of securitization of migration in the field began prior to the Maastricht Treaty or 9/11.

O'Neill has a unique element to his research which is the study of the ENP and how it is used to control and securitise the Southern borders of Europe. It is highlighted the Mediterranean Basin has the steepest demographic gradient in the world and this has greatly affected how the EU has viewed its North African neighbours as a growing security concern (Koikkalainen, 2011). O'Neill outlines how the ENP is used to gain a level of control over peripheral neighbours. "The ENP seeks to overcome the shortcomings of traditional migration control policies by requiring migration-sending and transit countries to embrace the EU's norms and values" (O'Neill, 2006, page 333). By creating a 'buffer' zone using the peripheries of Europe the EU is attempting to create a secure zone around its external territory. A criticism of O'Neill is that he does not investigate fully the extent to which the EU has a Janus faced identity, one of national interests of member states like the UK and one of regional interest. This is where this research will contribute to the literature because it will explore the juxtaposed national security interest versus the regional security interest and how this has caused the migration policies of the EU to stagnate and halt development of a region wide human migration policy. It will use the work of Bourdieu to assess how the manipulative or cooperative behaviours have affect the different levels of governance in relation to external migration control.

Another academic that has evolved the Copenhagen School to analyse the securitization of migration is Sarah Léonard. Léonard (2010) explores the theme of securitization of migration through the practices of the EU and its institutions rather than looking at the theme theoretically as previous academics have. By analysing Frontex, Léonard explores that securitization is happening not so much

through policy but through practices and the use of such buzz words as integrated border management (IBM) (Léonard, 2010). There are many ways that Frontex can be seen as a way in which the EU is securitizing its practices. Léonard illustrates that Frontex is the closest that the EU has even been to fully coordinating external border management, and it is this part Frontex that has received most attention by the media as well as academics (Léonard, 2010). One of the most interesting facets of Frontex that Léonard explores is the way in which it aids member states to organise the return of migrants to their country of origin and how it is one of the most important securitizing factors of the EU. "Nowhere else in the world, and never before, has there been such a high level of sophistication in the coordination of operations aiming to expel certain groups of migrants" (Léonard, 2010, page 246). Léonard's use of word certain implies that particular groups of migrants are perceived as more of a threat than others. All across migration literature unwanted EU migrants are mostly deduced as illegal migrants and from under developed states whose control requires a number of different domestic and regional mechanisms. This thesis is unique as it examines not only one migration control mechanism but other policies and structures to understand the complexities of the behaviours that the field produces. The literature needs to move away from examining singular facets of migration control like Frontex and look at the broader behaviours of actors, like the UK and the influences they have on all levels of external migration governance.

More recently there has been a change in the securitization narrative with more academics evolving our understanding of the original concepts put forward by the Copenhagen school. Balzacq et al (2016) look at the development of securitization as a tool of analysis for analysing governance. Their discussion looks beyond securitization as merely a speech act, which sets it apart from other pieces of work. They critically examine how securitization can cause an analysis of an issue to become blinded by the security rhetoric as more research fills the space around the topic of securitization. "The precise point is not that such issues are not or should not be linked, but rather that such issue linkages are never neutral. They deserve analysis, as they can often obscure alternative understandings and causal chains" (Balzacq et al, 2016, page 505). It opens the space to discuss how securitization can open the doors to other ways of understanding the issues that would normally be shut off if one analysed something like the external migration control field within a rigid understanding of securitization. A broader securitization space allows for the boundaries of understanding politics and security to be more malleable. It also challenges the traditional literature insofar as it begins to review the structure and agency of the field by attempting to deconstruct linkages and how actors fit within those linkages.

An argument developed further by Kaunert et al (2017) who explores securitization as a "strategic or pragmatic practice" (page 30). They critique former uses of securitization by proponents of the Copenhagen School, in particular how the audience is often ignored in the framework but also an

absence of a debate centring on the relationship between the agent and the structure. In an earlier article with Léonard (Kaunert and Léonard, 2012) they suggest a reformulation of the approach to securitization as a more flexible tool for analysis. Kaunert et al (2017), develops this further by suggesting that the EU itself could act as a securitizing actor. A more fluid definition of who can be a securitizing actor and a more flexible approach to securitization demonstrates that research which pushes beyond the boundaries of the Copenhagen School approach can be just as legitimate. The application of theorists such as Bourdieu can only seek to better the understanding of the external migration control field and the UK as an actor of that field. Not only does this reimagine security studies, but IR more widely. Something which Léonard and Kaunert advocate further in their book *Refugees, Security and the European Union* (2019). Whilst they specifically focus on refugees, the theoretical framework they use develops from their previous work, creating an original analytical tool. They discuss that whilst speech acts occur as valid forms of securitization, they also utilise Huysmans (2004 and 2006) to discuss viewing securitizing practices as another avenue of understanding (Léonard and Kaunert, 2019). They believe that by approaching EU asylum and migration policy from a practice based point of view you can develop a more thorough understanding of securitizing practices as much of the public rhetoric is one of humanitarianism or when there is no securitizing discourse. This wider framework of understanding also allows for other behaviours in the field to be discovered. However, it still leaves a gap in understanding the relationship between the structure and agency of actors in the external migration control field.

The changes in approach to securitization can be recognised in more empirical research that has been undertaken in the past few years (Hintjens, 2019, Bourbeau, 2015, Ghezelbash, 2018 and Lemaire, 2018). Bourbeau (2015) discusses the connection between resilience and EU security practices drawing on Bigo (2002) to support his argument, the more open framework of understanding securitization allows for more than just a discussion of speech acts, it reveals the possibility of understanding how actors demonstrate more than just securitizing behaviours through the implementation of policy and practice. This is particularly important when assessing the external migration control field as some behaviours can be attributed to securitizing practices whilst others behaviours could have been overlooked if using a more traditional securitization framework. Hintjens (2019) explores failed acts of securitization during the 2015 migration 'crisis'. She discusses how securitizing practices cannot be understood in a linear way, understanding how these practices transpire in relation to wider behaviours and the context to which practices are occurring must be understood in order to full appreciate the field in question.

Filling the Gaps – What is the Contribution?

This section will discussion the original contribution of this thesis, exploring the key areas of knowledge that it will add to the literature. It will firstly discuss how the approach used will expand the theoretical frameworks of IR. Secondly it will explore how the securitization framework applied in this research challenges and expands the current understanding of securitization in relation to external migration control.

At present IR has done little to develop the narrative of migration and is stagnating around discussions of borders and security (Weiner, 1985, Mitchell, 1989 and Hollifield, 1992. This research will expand upon Weiner's acknowledgement that EU member states recognise the importance of migration as a tool to reorder the national boundaries. This thesis will develop and modernise IR migration literature by exposing more complex relationships that structure the external migration control field. This is why the UK was chosen as the key unit of analysis as its unique position within the field offers a thought-provoking insight into how the field functions. The literature needs to be expanded away from a discussion of internal politics and develop more into a conversation of how linkages and doxical norms within the field effect policy as well as contributing factors from outside the field and this is what this thesis has achieved. It will also expand the critical literature of external migration controls by understanding relations beyond that of positive and negative relations through the seeking of cooperative and manipulative behaviour evidenced in the data analysed.

This research reflects how differing policies are a lens in which to see the relationship the UK has with the EU, that policies and engagement with mechanism of the field such as Frontex. This thesis expands beyond the space of security and understands how other behaviours are present and what this does to the structure of the field, whether the behaviour could be considered manipulative or cooperative. Unlike the majority of existing literature this research understands that the securitization and subsequent changes to the structures of the field pre date the creation and implementation of the Schengen Accord (Martin, 1999, Ireland 1991 and Geddes 1997 & 2000) This gives rise for this thesis to explore and present a unique element of 'Fortress Europe' literature that acknowledges all the factors both political and economic that give rise to Europe managing its external borders.

One of the unique identifiers of this research is the analysis of manipulative behaviour by the UK in the external migration control field. Manipulative behaviour by actors in any field of area of research in IR has had little attention however, this thesis opens the discussion into a modern understanding of what manipulation might mean for actors in the external migration control field and how as a behaviours it has the potential to change an actors position in the field as well as effecting structures and mechanisms. It is of particular interest to those that study the EU more broadly as it could be used

as a concept to understand a number of different relationship between national and regional actors, both within the EU and outside of it.

There is a distinct gap in the literature around how the continual securitization of external migration effects the structures of the field. The current literature approaches using a securitization framework to only study reactive policies and approaches to issues, rather than looking at securitization as a continuum (Huysmans 1995, 2000 & 2006, Adamson, 2006, Boswell, 2007, Wæver et al, 1993 and O'Neill, 2006). This has been addressed by exploring how the UK and the EU has always kept migration and security policy relatively close together but it will highlight that to integrate its security and migration policies the EU is a long way from completing this consolidation because of manipulative behaviour from the UK in the field of external migration control. This thesis has also developed this idea by critically assessing the UK and EU attempts toward developing relationships with its peripheral neighbours through strategies such as the ENP and how through schemes such as the ENP there are elements of control and security rather than development and friendship. It complements the core concept of cooperation between the actors.

As discussed earlier in the chapter there is a large gap in the securitization literature where there is little discussion around the structure and agency dichotomy when dismantling the external migration control field. This thesis will directly look at how the UK engages with the structures that have been historically established in the field and how this engagement effects its position within the field but also how that engagement could have an impact on the structures of the field. Unlike other securitization literature which shies away tackling the agency/structure narrative this research uses a unique theoretical framework to understand how the UK manages its position in the external migration control field.

Conclusions

This research around the subject of UK and EU external migration control will position itself within all of these themes and create a piece of literature that will explore the policy structures and apply the theories of Bourdieu to understand the behaviours of actors in the EU external migration control field. The IR literature on the subject of human migration in too broad to ever get an in depth understanding of an actor's behaviour. This thesis provides the specificity that the literature needs alongside expanding the theoretical boundaries of the subject. Much of the substantial literature on migration and IR is older and does not take into account recent migration trends and political structures. The policy literature has informed this research by illustrating how the EU control structures compare to other states and regions. However, the literature concentrates on the impact of the policies, what this research will create is analysis of how these policies where created and how their conception and

creation impacted upon actor's relationships in the field. The next chapter will outline the theoretical framework that will analyse the data chosen to answer the research question.

The Theoretical Framework:
Constructivism and Bourdieu

External human migration (human migration that originates from outside the EU) has been a growing concern to individuals, communities, governments and regions of the European Union (EU) and its member states. The migration boom of the past 50 years has been unprecedented, especially in Europe, effecting the development of the modern world, politically, economically and culturally. This chapter will introduce the theoretical framework which will assess these dramatic changes to the external migration control landscape. The discussion will begin with how Constructivism has informed the foundations of the framework, in particular the work of Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan. From the concepts of securitization and Speech Acts the discussion will move on to the work of Pierre Bourdieu, whose theoretical framework dominates the theoretical approach of this research. As well as a Bourdieu other scholars who have adapted his work will be discussed as they have informed the use of Field Theory, alongside his other theoretical concepts such as doxa and habitus. Special attention will be given to how theories outside of the discipline of IR not only compliment the core concepts of securitization, manipulation and cooperation but how they can be threaded with IR theories to create a strong theoretical framework which will support the research questions and methodology of this thesis.

Constructivism

Constructivism is the analysis of the agents and structures of international relations whose actions are explained through a sociological and historical understanding. A constructivist would argue that a state or institution is constructed through social and historical influences. Nicholas Onuf (1989) was the first IR scholar to coin the term constructivism in relation to IR (Jackson and Sørensen, 2010). A current example of this is the possible accession of Turkey into the EU. One of the concerns is the social integration of a state that whose population is predominantly Muslim. Although there are concerns about the stability of the state, especially the civil unrest between the Turkish and the Kurdish populations many of the decisions and negotiations surrounding the possible accession have been influenced more by the idea of societal differences (europa.eu, 2004). A constructivist would argue that the unlikely accession of Turkey to the Union would not necessarily only be based upon member states national security being threatened it is the threat of a different culture permeating the EU making it less "European" alongside previous colonial tensions between the Ottoman empire and European states.

Alexander Wendt is one of the leading and influential IR constructivist thinkers and his work discussing the relationship between agents and structure have become classic pieces of constructivist literature. Wendt critically deconstructs the dominant theories of that time; neorealism and world systems theory. He identifies how these theories lack a way in which to conceptualize "entities [individuals, states and institutions] and their relationship" (Wendt, 1987, page 338). What Wendt is demonstrating is the way in which to explain why an agent is the way it is, which is what neorealism and world system theory do not achieve. Wendt argues that a positivist approach does not take into account previous interaction between actors. He suggests "external relations are important for explaining what happens to entities in the course of their interaction, but they do not explain the essential characteristics of those entities themselves" (Wendt, 1987, page 346). This statement highlights the very framework of constructivist analysis which is; recognising the empirical interaction between states is important but it is the question of why they act the way they do, for example will states cooperate or become conflicted. Relations within the external migration control field cannot be analysed in isolation of the wider relations that exist, for example analysis of the UK's external migration control policies cannot be done in isolation of the EU. The essential characteristics of EU member states when they negotiate and use migration control mechanisms are key to understanding the policy decisions that have been made. Using Wendt's framework of understanding, an actor's behaviour must not be taken at face value but understood in context to historical and wider relation. In a later piece of work Wendt applies his concepts in context to security.

Wendt (1992) evolved his argument and looks specifically at the way in which states act when they are faced with a security dilemma. He argues that the structure of a state "is an ongoing [sic] accomplishment of practice, not a once-and-for-all creation of norms that somehow exist apart from practice" (Wendt, 1992, page 413). The 'practice' of security is something which is an ever changing challenge for states and now is a challenge for large regional institutions like the EU and for its member states, such as the UK. A security threat will change over time and a state's reaction to a perceived threat will also change. Wendt recognises the way in which territories and boundaries are perceived is not as simple as a line on the map; "In the modern world we are used to thinking of territorial boundaries as vanishing thin lines on a map, so that the states spatial extension is precisely delimited" (Wendt, 1998, page 211). The EU, for example, has adopted this very structure by decreasing the importance of internal borders and delimiting the power the EU has over its member states. As the sovereignty and boundaries of a member state change as does the way in which it will securitize against perceived threats. This malleable approach to how states use their territories has influenced how we could understand the UK as a manipulator in the external migration control field. The overall approach to the data has been with Wendt's idea that spatial delimitation is greatly influenced by

what it perceives as a threat, therefore the research question reflects the idea that the UKs participation in external migration controls and mechanisms can be a flexible approach. A flaw within in Wendt's work is how he does not analyse the detailed relationships that exist in a region like the EU. The complex web of member state relations versus the external relations of the EU and also bilateral relations between single member states and external neighbours is a detailed security nexus.

Around the same time as Wendt was discussing security and state structure the Copenhagen School was founded. The school focused on the ideas of constructivism and two of their biggest contributors are Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver. Unlike Wendt, Buzan and Wæver examined states and regional actors in greater detail allowing a better understanding of their complex relationship with security. Firstly, the main concepts of their work will be discussed and then there will be more a more detailed demonstration of the use of Speech Act Theory in informing the theoretical framework of this research, which both academics have been highly influential in developing.

The changing landscape of security studies in IR was highly influenced by Buzan and Wæver who took the core concepts of constructivism and began applying them to modern day security concerns. Their work reflects not only the change in the subject but also the changing political landscape at the end of the Cold War. Wæver and Buzan (1993) reflected of the fear societies had of mass migration across Western Europe just after the Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1992. It recognises the beginnings of what they perceive to be the securitization of migration across the world. Migratory routes are problematic for the societies of member states as well as the EU as a symbiotic "society" in which member states attempt to culturally and politically come together as one actor. However, not all member states engage with the EU project in the same way. The UK in particular still suffers from the "fear" of migration changing its societal make up even from migrants that are from the inside of the EU (Somerville, 2007), which in turn effect its international relations with member states and external neighbours of the EU such as North Africa. This complex web of security interests is looked at in more detail by Buzan in his work *People, States and Fear* (2nd Edition, 1991). Buzan recognises that security is not simply influenced by the actions of one state to another. The relationship exists at all levels of the state, regional and world.

"Security complexes offer a systemic approach to security analysis which requires attention to the macro level of great power impact on the system, the middle level of local state relations, and the micro level of domestic affairs. In forcing attention to all three levels, security complexes emphasize the mutuality of impact among them, with external influences tending to amplify local problems, and local problems shaping and constraining external entanglements and influences".

Buzan, 1991, page 222

Migration in the EU is shaped by these very ideas of different levels of the structure having direct impact on one another. The suspension of the Schengen area during the Arab Spring in 2011 is one such example which will be explored further later in the text. Like Wendt however the detail of the regional complexities is not explained in enough detail to better understand the externalisation of migration by the EU and member states and how these practices effect the structure of the field.

In a later text, developing the concept of 'new' security threats, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Buzan, Wæver and Wilde, 1998) demonstrates creating a constructivist framework for analysing the growing securitization of 'new' security issues such as societal and environmental security concerns. What the text illustrates is the need for constructivists to not throw away the traditional realist frameworks of analysis as they can help extend the subject further. "It is not just about tacking the word security onto economic, environmental and societal. Pursuing the wider security agenda requires giving careful consideration to what is meant by security and applying that understanding to a range of dynamics" (Buzan et al, 1998, page 195). As the framework for understanding the growing number of security concerns has developed, so has the framework in which to understand what a security threat is. The widening of the consideration of what is perceived and then acted upon as a security threat has influenced the way in which the data in this project has been approached. Rather than seeking data that is explicitly centred on the securitization of external migration, the practice of accepting a wider understanding of security rather than compartmentalising the concept allowed the search for data to be wider and include a variety of documents, a further discussion of this will be in the next chapter.

The use of a broader understanding of what constitutes a security threat was then developed further by the Copenhagen School. The Speech Act Theory is a method of analysing the way in which a 'threat' is securitized. In order for securitization to take place there needs to be a structure in place in which agents act their part. Firstly, there needs to be a threat for example migration and these threats can be real, perceived or a diversion. Secondly there needs to exist an object which is likely to be negatively affected by this threat for example a town and thirdly an audience who reacts positively to the speech act in order to justify the securitizing actions of the agent who has perceived this threat. Wæver summarises the key points of the Speech Act Theory: "by uttering "security" a state representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever mean are necessary to block it" (Wæver, 1995, page 55). What Wæver achieves through theorising the use of speech acts is a developed way of understanding how states justify the securitization processes against threats. If the speech act is used to develop policy for two separate issues such as security and migration, the act itself binds the two together therefore giving a state or institution more

right to act against both areas of policy. However, as Michael C. Williams argues that it is not as simple as a state claiming that action needs to be taken against a particular threat.

Williams (2003) offers a thorough analysis of the speech act theory as well as bringing it up to date to include security issues post-9/11. He addresses one of the biggest criticisms and misinterpretations of speech act theory (see McDonald, 2008 and Glover, 2011). "Security is not just any kind of speech act… It is a specific kind of act: what makes a particular speech act… is its casting of the issues one of an "existential threat" which calls for extraordinary measures beyond the routines and norms of everyday life" (Williams, 2003, page 514). The speech act is not an everyday occurrence of political life; it is a process. The securitization of migration in Europe began with the Treaty of Rome (1957) when migration of guest workers was seen as a potential threat so the speech act occurred. Title 3 of the treaty is titled *Free Movement of People, Services and Capital* which defines what a migrant in Europe can and cannot do. From that point in 1957 migration in the EU began its securitizing process. As Mitchell (2006) explored European states, such as Germany, saw migrants as workers first and later a threat to unemployment and welfare. The speech act then develops as the threat develops. This has greatly influenced the analysis of data for this research. It has focused the coding process to highlight speech acts made by actors, such as the UK, of the external migration control field.

Didier Bigo specifically looks at this is his article *Security and Migration* (2002). He develops the speech act by understanding that there are now more and more actors taking part. He supports Wæver's framework but also strengthens it by highlighting the way in which migration has been developed through politics and even claims that "the relation between security and migration is fully and immediately political" (Bigo, 2002, page 2002). He illustrates that this has been possible through the way in which migration policy has evolved and how society's perception of migration has greatly changed especially since the Maastricht Treaty (1992). One of the main reasons for this has been the "Europeanization" of migration as a security threat. Not only are internal EU migrants perceived as threat (particularly to those not within the Schengen area), external migrants from North Africa (and other areas) are also a threat to the whole of the EU. The sharing of power and sovereignty to control migration is itself a speech act. Frontex is a key development that was ultimately created out of the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) and a distinct marker which illustrates the evolution of the securitization of migration in Europe and of the external migration control field. The treaty was the speech act which empowered the EU to fund a new border control project that receives €143 million in funding per annum from the European Commission and associated states.

Media discourse, within the theory, is not represented as something that greatly impacts upon the speech acts of the political world. The media, especially online media outlets and social networking,

are of growing importance in representing the views of politicians as well as the general public. However, Williams (2003) did go some way to quashing this idea by highlighting that media outlets are facilitators of the speech act not the speech act itself. Speech act theory helps to understand the way in which states securitize but it does not explain why certain threats are securitized, why some are given higher priorities than others. Constructivism and the Copenhagen School are a solid IR framework for the research but the addition of other academics outside the field can strengthen the theoretical framework even further. Constructivism identifies what could be considered an act of securitization by using speech act theory but it offers little in relation to a field of analysis. The literature focusses too much on securitization, what is needed is a better interpretation of different behaviours in relation to the norms of the field. For example, speech acts can be used to identify cooperative and manipulative behaviour, therefore widening the scope in which it can be used. What will now be illustrated is by using other thinkers such as Pierre Bourdieu and how the threads of constructivism discussed can be pulled together to build an effective frame work to deconstruct the behaviours of the external migration control field.

Bourdieu: Field Theory, Capital Habitus and Doxa

Unlike Constructivism, Bourdieu allows for a greater number of actors to be considered and cross referenced by using the term field: "The government is not the field of power, but is one of the sites in which power operates" (Webb et al, 2002, page 86). Fields are areas in which individuals, states and international institutions can operate. There are two main types of field, cultural and political, Bourdieu (2010) insists that although they are linked they can be analysed separately. For the purposes of deconstructing the securitization of migration by the UK as an actor in the external migration control field, the political fields of power are most applicable. When referring to a field of power it will be a political field, unless otherwise stated. Bourdieu believes that a political field of power reduces the status of citizens to consumer as they have control of the 'products' they 'consume', it is in turn a "field of ideological production" (Bourdieu, 1991, page 177). The external migration control field is the field in which this thesis explores the relationships and mechanism that actors use and how relationships have developed and shaped the field.

Migration is an issue that posits many fields of power, security, economic, geographies demographics and political (Assem and Drent, 2012). This is where one can see the ability of field theory to transcend the binary border debates that are discussed by academics such as Geddes (2000 and 2008). Bourdieu is a starting point for the analysis of securitization however there are other academics that have taken his work further. Bigo (others such as Berling 2012, Cohen 2011 and Leander 2006, 2011 also use Bourdieu and will be discussed further later in this chapter) is an advocate of the way in which

Bourdieu deconstructs the traditional structures power and security and how they have wider application beyond sociology. Bigo discusses the gap between the traditional internal/external narrative and policing/military arguments and how these theoretical gaps could be pulled together (see Ceyhan and Tsoukala, 2002). However instead of concluding that the EU and its member states are securitizing migration beyond their own borders, Bigo is using Bourdieu's theories to take the argument further and suggests that: "security has come to depend on security networks, agreements between countries and security agencies, and even on private insurance systems and companies" (Bigo, 2001, page 105). Security is no longer something that a state has the sole franchise of, it is passed on to agencies, such as Frontex, further within the borders of a state and beyond the borders of a state.

Bigo explains how deeper securitization is partially down to the end of the Cold War. He believes that the loss of the Soviet Union had a similar effect on security policy within states such as the USA, as the loss of the gold exchange standard had on the international monetary system (Bigo, 2001). It left security issues, whether they be environment, human or military, in a vacuum with more powerful states making sure that the security issues they found most important were placed in their own field of power. "They [fields] are nearly always the product of relations and the circulation of power inside and between fields, as well as an imposition of problems coming from the dominant field" (Bigo, 2011, page 231). However, Bigo highlights the importance of context when looking at domination and the creation of fields by more powerful states is to realise that it is situated in time, space and subject area. Examined in this research the external migration control field starts at the Treaty of Rome in 1957 up until the end of 2014. The value of Bourdieu is that the actors, and the roles they have within the field, can be fluid and change according to circumstances, whether they be political or cultural.

Bigo furthers his deconstruction of Bourdieu's field theory by offering the idea that fields create borders, however the boundaries that fields create are more flexible. "The boundaries of the field are then almost always in a process of changing flux. Indeed, fields can merge or differentiate through time" (Bigo, 2011, page 240). This is an amalgamation of the two ideas that have been discussed, on the one hand there still are borders to protect however they may not necessarily be geographical, and they could be based on political ideology for example. On the other hand, the field theory allows scholars to analyse structures that do not exist in terms of institutions or states. It allows, for example, the way in which migration is securitized in the EU outside of the conventional arguments to be identified. Rather than viewing it as something which is securitized it can be viewed as a manipulative or cooperative act. In relation to this project the analysis of the data will be able to identify manipulative and cooperate behaviours of the actors within the external migration control field.

Berling (2012) has constructed a basic analysis of Bourdieu and his use in International Relations and the subject of security. What she argues is that the way in which the EU is now structured with its multiple actors who transcend the national and/or the regional the more traditional analysis is insufficient, especially in terms of security. Security is no longer state centred and controlled solely by the military it is progressively becoming dominated by 'insecurity' professionals (Berling, 2012). "[insecurity professionals are] establishing a high degree of hegemony over European security knowledge especially in relation to immigration" (Berling, 2012). A member state, the EU or other actors, dependent on the field, may no longer be viewed as the hegemonic power of the securitization of migration. It is now the responsibility of actors such as Frontex or the ENP who have created a new field of power (Bigo, 2000). One in which they can influence policy by writing reports on the issue and publishing papers in the press that create the perceived threat of migration, which in time has caused the securitization of migration. In relation to this research, field theory can aid the exploration of the complex and multifaceted approach to migration control that the EU and its member states have created. However, Berling perceives this to be a reaction since the creation of the JHA pillar in 1992 however this research will analyse data which shows the behaviours of the external migration control field predate 1992, going back as far as 1957.

In IR there has been a growing interest of non-military security arguments since the mid 1980's with the Copenhagen School of Security Studies leading the way. The shift in literature outside of IR, in areas such as Sociology and Cultural Studies, place the paradigmatic shift of analysis in the early 2000's around the time of 9/11 (for example Berling 2012 and Huysmans 2006). This research will prove that the politics of insecurity began earlier in the century. The Nottingham and Notting Hill race riots in 1958 and Enoch Powell's *Rivers of Blood* (1968) speech were early evidence of growing insecurity in the UK alone, as stricter entry rules were enforced after each cultural and political event. Sassen (1999) even predates the existence of securitization to the late 19th century the creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) and its evolution into the EU was a reaction to economic insecurity, which migration was part of, were all the beginnings of the securitization of migration. As Leander (2011) explains, Bourdieu can 'stage' international relations, because it deconstructs the paradigms of traditional structures of analysis. The securitization of migration can be broken down into smaller fields of analysis as well as be able to make more connections surrounding the relationships of these fields. When analysing the data sets for this research the field can be used at its largest or to investigate more intricate relationships between particular actors.

An example of which can be found in the work of Huysmans. Huysmans' book titled *The Politics of Insecurity* (2006) goes deeper into the analysis of the changing structures of migration security in the EU and of its member states. In an earlier article *The European Union and the Securitization of*

Migration (2000) Huysmans examines how migration as a security issue had effected and was continuing to affect the integration process of the EU. At this point in history it also appeared that the EU would attempt to create a common migration policy which is reflected in the positive outlook of the article. He argues that migration was rendered a security issue more than a political or a societal issue. This is a theme which he continues through to *The Politics of Insecurity* (2006). However, in this text he realises that the securitization is occurring at multiple levels, both regionally and nationally, rather than just at EU policy making levels. Huysmans uses Bigo to illustrate that the network of securitization is moving beyond the 'normal' limits of bureaucracy. This is where Bourdieu allows a researcher to use his tools of analysis to understand that you can construct fields to enable you to analyse what the normal agency versus structures argument cannot.

Bourdieu was a sociologist, anthropologist, philosopher and political commentator that spent much of his career at Science Po in Paris researching the concept of power. He concerned himself with how power was transferred between different actors in society and how structures of power were passed through generations, especially through the education system. He created a unique means of understanding these systems: Field Theory. Bourdieu's texts *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991) and *Distinction* (translated by Bennett 2010, originally published in 1979) both discuss field theory, however Bourdieu wrote *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991) much later in his career. For Bourdieu fields are malleable units of analysis that can be formed by researchers to group together actors who are interconnected either through power that they share or power they wish to gain; Bourdieu refers to this as capital. "Capital is the sum of resources actual or virtual" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, page 119). The capital forms part of the network in which the actors of the field relate to one another. It becomes an asset to an actor and has the ability to maintain or improve their position within the field. Greater discussion of capital in relation to this research will be later in this chapter.

Bourdieu explains field theory as a methodological instrument, a means of understanding why actors pursue particular capital gains at particular junctures (Bourdieu, 1991). In context to this research particular political and/or historical markers have been used assess an actor's behaviour. These markers are the Maastricht Treaty (1992), the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) and the UK Immigration Bill (2014) as they illustrate key moments in the history between the two actors where large amounts of capital have been gained or lost. This complex web of exchanges is made even more complex when actors play 'the double game' whereby they gain power whilst maintain social relationships and social structures (Bourdieu, 1991). "The political discourses produced by professionals are always doubly determined, and affected by a duplicity which is not in the least intentional since it results from the duality of fields of reference and the necessity of serving at one and the same time the esoteric aims of internal struggles and the exoteric aims of external struggles" (Bourdieu, 1991, page 183). An actor

in a field will always look to manipulate their position in order to gain more capital, which will be explored in much greater detail later in the thesis.

Bourdieu has written extensively on the formation and reproduction of the state. In an article headed *Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field* (1994) Bourdieu explores how the power of the state comes from its ability to produce and impose power to all things within the social world. The state is a "set of people recognising the same universal principles" (Bourdieu, 2014, page 12). He pulls on Max Weber's ideas that a state is an undetermined entity which lays claim to the use of physical and symbolic violence over a specific territory and the population that lives within it. This power is housed and utilised through "specific organisational structure and mechanisms" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 4). The organisational structures and mechanisms in the field of external migration control are managed by the EU. This research extends the understanding of the state in Bourdieusian terms to include a regional actor as the most dominant in the field as the EU. The EU has the dominant role of ensuring the doxa is maintained within the external migration control field. The EU can then extend its power through state actors, in the case of this research, the UK alongside other key actors such as Frontex.

The field that will be created as a unit of analysis for this research is the external migration control field and the capital will be the level of control over external migration. The power that is exercised by actors in the field is not necessarily a literal power it can be symbolic: "symbolic power is that invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that themselves exercise it" (Bourdieu, 1991, page 163). This concept follows a neo-Kantian tradition of seeing different symbolic universes as structures of knowing and forming the world around us. Symbolic power allows there to be a consensus because it facilitates the social world we live in (Bourdieu, 1991). The use of symbols by certain groups give them a distinctive positon in the field. The most dominant actor in the field will set their own position as their ideology is doubly determined not only do they produce the symbols they also maintain them. Bourdieu expresses that symbolic power is not illocutionary, it is through the relationship between those who exercise it and those who submit to it, for example a teacher and a student.

Symbolic power is the way in which the dominant actor ensures that the doxa of the field are adhered to, it is a "power that is exercised in such an invisible way that people are unaware of its existence, and those subject to it are the first among these, since the very exercise of this power depends in this lack of awareness" (Bourdieu, 2014, page 163). Symbolic power is built over time and is woven into the fabric of the field, adhered to and if not an actor will be held to account and possibly have its position in the field altered to a less desirable positon. Autonomy within a field exists because of

accumulated capital, for example, UK participation in particular structures like Frontex allows it greater autonomy.

Bourdieu expands upon his discussion of the state by claiming that; "The state is the culmination of a process of concentration of different species of capital" (1994, page 4). The different capitals could be associated with physical force such as an army, economic capital, informational capital, cultural capital and symbolic capital. The state for Bourdieu encapsulates all of these differing forms of capital and becomes a "meta-capital granting power over other species of capital and their holders" (1994, page 4). This then enables the state to exercise power over a number of different fields, allowing fields to gain capital but also reserves the power to revoke capital from fields too. The type of capital created is dependent on the field. Capital then indirectly effects the structures of the field, this actions is dependent on who controls the field (Bourdieu, 2005). Whilst the processes for gaining each individual type of capital can be separate from one another, Bourdieu argues that the processes are interdependent, therefore should not be seen in complete isolation. In relation to the EU being the most dominant actor in the external migration control field, one can see how the EU fits in easily into the traditional role of the state, being part of multiple fields with the ability to grant capital and take it away if needed. The UK, as the key focus of this research, sits as a key actor within the field and is susceptible to the dominance of the EU as head of the field. It means the UK is not in a position to change the doxa of the field but can use habitual behaviours and gain capital to change its position in the field by using the structures and mechanisms put in place by the EU, or those that have been jointly created.

In his discussion of information capital Bourdieu claims that the state enforces common values and ways of thinking through state structures which constructs the identity of the state. In other words, the way that we view the state is in fact a product of the state and the state is simply a structure where a "set of people [are] recognising the same universal principles" (Bourdieu, 2014, page 12). Symbolic capital on the other hand is more malleable as a concept, Bourdieu views it as: "any property… when it is perceived by social agents endowed with categories of perception which cause them to know it and to recognise it, to give it value" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 8). Whilst symbolic capital does not necessarily have a physical value or form, it is often one of the more powerful forms of capital as it embodies the values and cultural of the structures it forms and the power that whomever controls symbolic capital has. In relation how the state bestows capital Bourdieu argues that, "there is a shift from a diffuse symbolic capital, resting solely on collective recognition, to an objectified symbolic capital, codified, delegated and guaranteed by the state, in a word bureaucratised" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 11). Delegated capital is key in allowing an actor to exist and participate within the field, particularly if the actors wishes to gain a better position within that field, like the UK in the external

migration control field in order to have more sway on how it is managed. By gaining capital the UK solidifies or even has the possibility of bettering its position in the field.

Other sociologists such as Richard Jenkins and IR academic Rebecca Adler-Nissen (2008) illuminate the possibilities of what can be done with Bourdieu's concept of capital. Jenkins breaks down Bourdieu's understanding of capital further claiming that there are 4 categories; economic, social, cultural and symbolic (Jenkins, 2002). All these differing forms of capital form the field as well as facilitating interactions within it. However, the forms of capital addressed by Bourdieu can be reinterpreted as Adler-Nissen also claims that political actors will also compete for diplomatic capital (2008). This is because an actor's primary concern is the improvement of its position within the field, whether that be to preserve it or to improve it (Field, 2003). This is what will be used to examine the UK's behaviour in relation to external migration control to assess how they maintain their relationships with other actors.

Bourdieu then furthers the discussion of symbolic capital by exploring the behaviours of submission and obedience whereby it "creates the conditions for a kind of immediate orchestration of habituses which is itself the foundation of a consensus over this set of shared evidences constitutive of common sense" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 13). Submission and obedience are key when analysing the external migration control field, as key doxic norms like freedom of movement must be abided by, however, the orchestration of habituses as Bourdieu mentions are what are created out of the submission of actors within the field, areas in which actors can stray from the doxic submission so readily wielded by the most dominant actor, in this case the EU. However, the most dominant actor does not always use its position of power in such an explicit way, as Bourdieu explains; "The dominant is the one that occupies a position in the structure such that the structure acts on its behalf" by defining what is regular and what are the rules (Bourdieu, 2005, page 195). This thesis uses the parliamentary transcripts, policy documents and reports to understand how the UK fits within this structure to demonstrate how their submission to the doxa of the field is readily evidenced through policy creation, implementation and interactions with other actors in the field or as Bourdieu writes "doxic submission to the established order" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 15).

The definition between doxa and habitus can often be blurred, the lines crossing between the two and one becoming the other. However, there is a distinct need to ensure that the two concepts are clearly defined as they serve very different purposes within any given field, in the case of this research, the external migration control field. Firstly there will be a discussion of doxa, how it relates to this research and how it influences actors in the field. Secondly there will be a discussion of the habituses of the field, how they are created and maintained alongside how they affect an actor's position in the

field. Thirdly there will be a conversation of how the habitus and doxa intersect in the field of external migration control.

Before doxa can be established the field needs to be created. Actors create the field deforming the space and inserting their own structures. The field of analysis for this research is the area of external migration control. This field was identified as it holds a unique collection of actors and norms. Other actors in the field are made of member states, organisations such as Frontex, and neighbouring states to the EU. The most important actor however, and the subject of this research is the UK. The UK has been chosen as previous theoretical insights into its relationship with the EU in relation to external migration control are limited, with most discussions centring on the concept of securitization. Whilst this thesis does explore securitization it is done within a space that allows for discussion to move away from the standard UK/EU rhetoric.

From the space during the establishment of the field comes the insertion of doxa, as Bourdieu describes it doxa is a "particular point of view, the point of view of the dominant, when it presents and imposes itself as a universal point of view" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 15). The universal view is then adopted by all those within the field. In the case of the external migration control field the doxa was founded around the time of the Treaty of Rome (1957) with the then EEC deforming the migration control space and re-establishing a new cross regional order. "It is the immediate and tacit agreement, in every respect opposed to an explicit contract, that founds the relation of doxic submission which attaches us to the established order with all the ties of the unconscious" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 14). The difference between doxa and norms, discussed by Constructivists such as Wendt and Weaver (1992 and 1995), is that doxa is a submission, it is completely unconscious, and its implicit nature forgoes the norm building that actors undertake by a Constructivists standard. Bourdieu challenges the Marxist understanding of consciousness; "It is the doxic submission of the dominated to the structures of a social order of which their mental structures are the product that Marxism cannot understand insofar as it remains trapped in the intellectualist tradition of the philosophies of consciousness" (Bourdieu, 1994, page 14). Bourdieu speaks of doxa as existing across structures of the field, it is accepted by actors in the field as self-evident and is an adherence to relations of order. The structures it creates posit the real world, as Bourdieu describes, and the thought world, inextricably linking them so that adherence to it becomes unconscious (Bourdieu, 1984). Doxa as the universe of the undiscussed and undisputed (Bourdieu, 1977). This is not to say that once the doxa is established that it cannot be challenged. Bourdieu discusses the idea that crisis can bring doxa into question but is not sufficient enough to change it. For example the suspension of the Schengen Agreement during the Arab Spring in 2011 and the reinstate of a number of internal EU borders during the so called refugee "crisis" in 2015 can be viewed as watershed moments which could have altered the doxa.

However, these moments in recent external migration control history did little to change the doxa, this is because the dominant actor seeks to defend the doxa. If the doxa changes so do the structures that it has built and maintained, therefore damaging, or at worst, dismantling the power held by the most dominant actor.

Habitus is another concept that forms part of Bourdieu's complex framework of understanding. One of the many definitions he has given habitus is:

"[Habitus] is necessity internalised and converted into a disposition that generates meaningful practices and meaning giving perceptions; it is a general, transposable disposition which carries out a systematic, universal application – beyond the limits of what has been directly learnt – of the necessity inherent in the learning conditions".

Bourdieu, 1984, page 170

It is one of the more challenging concepts as it is a concept that has evolved throughout Bourdieu's work. Habitus is an estimation of chances based on past transformations, however, they are firstly defined without calculation. Habitus is often a reactive behaviour with little thought, however, past experiences of actors in the field play a part in its conception and delivery. For example, the UK producing law that would relate to the external migration control field means it will keep the doxa intact, however, to gain capital in the field or to change position within the field, habitual behaviours are calculated from previous interactions and implemented to attain the aim it wished. As such, habitus is a product of history, it has infinite capacity as it is not just a reproduction of the original condition, and it takes into account habituses that have gone before it. Habitus is "objectively 'regulated' and 'regular' without being in any way the product of obedience to the rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organising action of a conductor" (Bourdieu, 1992, page 53). The conductor of the external migration control field is the EU and habitus can be formed by the UK without having to necessarily conform to the dominant structures and behaviours, such as the UK not being part of the Schengen area but still taking part in Frontex (a more in-depth discussion of this dichotomy is in the analytical chapters of this thesis). Habitus will manage its own constancy by defending itself against new information that goes against its accumulated information. Habitus will then protect itself from crisis and will find a way to reinforce its disposition, they are temporal structures that adjust to a probable future. This is the key difference between habitus and doxa is the temporary nature of it. However, habitus is not always viewed as a deviant act and is produced within regulations and is "objectively adjusted to the logic characteristic of a particular field" (Bourdieu, 1992, page 56). As it can be produced within the standard regulations of a field, the most dominant actor (the EU) can trust actors within the field to remain within the doxa and structures

it produces. It allows the UK to deviate from the field, to ensure its own objectives are met whilst appearing to conform to the doxa of the external migration control field.

Habitus operates in the external migration control field by allowing the UK a flexibility that is unique to its position within the field. Whilst the UK can be viewed as an actor that continually pushes against the doxic structures and norms implemented by the EU, especially when viewed through theoretical lenses such as Constructivism, Bourdieu's concept of habitus opens the possibility that whilst the UK can be a deviant actor, underneath the public rhetoric lies an actor who is continually addressing and readdressing its position within the field. Habitus particularly affords the external migration field the ability to act in self-interest, such as the creation of bilateral agreements. This is where the intersection between doxa and habitus in the external migration control field lies. Doxa acts as the check and balance that the UK needs to ensure that its habitual behaviours are within the established structures of the field. Whilst the unconscious submission to these doxic structures do not appear explicitly in the relationship the UK has with the EU this thesis will discuss the continual submission of the UK to the doxa of the external migration control field, which is the securitization of external migration controls and mechanisms.

Rebecca Adler-Nissen (2008, 2011, 2012 and 2014), Didier Bigo (2011), Matthew Eagleton-Pierce (2014), Stefano Guzzini (2006) and Mikael Rask Madsen (2016), are the handful of academics who have explicitly used elements of Bourdieu's work. However, the frameworks they use do not employ Bourdieu's frameworks to analyse fields, rather they discuss the possible positive or negative impacts that he could have on the subject, one exception is Adler-Nissen whose article *The diplomacy of opting out: A Bourdieusian approach to national integration strategies* (2008) uses Bourdieu's idea of gaining capital in relation to European integration (Alder-Nissen and her work that uses Bourdieu will be examined in greater depth later in the thesis). Other than this one exception the articles only use particular elements of Bourdieu's work to understand international relations, for example Eagleton-Pierce uses symbolic power and Madsen uses fields and power. The articles do little in moving forward and applying Bourdieu's work in a practical sense.

The main components of the theoretical frameworks are the core concept of speech acts from Constructivism and marries them with Bourdieu's concepts of fields, capital, doxa and habitus. The theory of speech acts identifies the key moments in the external migration control field and Bourdieu's key concepts are then used to deconstruct these speech acts further as speech acts alone cannot reveal the complexities of the field. These have been brought together as Constructivism lacks the nuanced approach that would allow a researcher to discover other behaviours present in the field. Whilst Bourdieu rarely discusses how changes to the field can affect the established norms and how

these changes impact how actors, like the UK, the approach of this thesis is to discuss how changes to the structures and mechanisms of external migration control can have the potential to alter the field. Whilst theorists such as Bigo (2000, 2002, 2011 and 2014) and Berling (2012) have moved the discussion of Bourdieu into the field of security, I believe the Bourdieu can offer more when combined with Constructivism to see how the behaviours of manipulation and cooperation work alongside securitization in the field.

The complexities of the framework are mitigated by the unique insight gained, an insight whereby securitization is not the sole focus which reveals a truer picture of the UK's relationship with the EU. It has allowed data to be interpreted beyond the language of securitization to produce an understanding of how the UK works within the external migration control field. If this research had been undertaken with a purely Constructivist framework the behaviours of manipulation and cooperation may not have been considered, and would have produced another piece of research regarding securitization and migration in the EU. This framework also extends the theoretical boundaries of IR. As discussed in earlier there has been use of Bourdieu within IR but this is unique in the practical application of his concepts to the topic of migration control. The unique nature of the theoretical framework adds to the originality of this thesis. This research takes Bourdieu and IR away from just discussing how his work could be used and applies it to a unique case study. This thesis also addresses the gap in the theoretical frameworks of securitization by engaging with the agency/structure dichotomy. It directly tackles the position of the UK in the structure of the field, investigating how decisions made by the actor effect the doxa, if at all and how the habitual behaviours of the UK challenge or reinforce its relationship with the most dominant actor of the field, the EU. As discussed in the Literature Review, very little IR or securitization literature tackles the agent/structure when investigating migration controls, perhaps because of the theoretical complexities of attempting to achieve it. However, this thesis directly engages with the historically built structures of the external migration control field and deconstructs how engagement or disengagement by the UK effect those structures. The adoption of this framework has also informed how the core themes, which also form the themes of the chapters, this will now be discussed in more detail.

The core themes of securitization, cooperation and manipulation are distinct from one another, however, they also share a relationship that has been informed by the theoretical framework. The interrelated nature is based upon the theme of securitization. Securitization is distinct as it is the doxa of the field, it is the default position in which all other interactions are based, therefore, cooperation and manipulation whilst at times are distinct, they also form part of a wider understanding of the security nexus of the external migration control field. The most distinct is the theme of manipulation as it is linked the most directly to habitus. As discussed, habitus are behaviours which are often

reactive however they are based upon experiences of the actors but are not a product of an obedience to the rules, manipulative behaviour falls into this category (Bourdieu, 1992). As they are not an obedience to the doxa, they have the potential to be deviations from it therefore could manipulate the structures of the field. This instances of habitual behaviour are also linked to an attempt to gain capital by the UK. Capital is deployed by the EU and "given" to the UK as habitus becomes an illusion of submitting to the most dominant in the field. The UK consciously using habitual behaviours demonstrates a conscious act of building capital, whether to gain a better position in the field, preserve it the position or potentially change the structures of the field all together (Adler-Nissen, 2008). Manipulation has the smallest chance of being linked to the doxa as manipulative behaviour is more likely to challenge the doxa than any other behaviours, especially if the EU becomes aware of the deviance which could alter the structure of the field. However, manipulative behaviour can also be attributed to securitization, it becomes manipulative when the behaviours does not exactly conform to the exact rules of the external migration control field and instead begins to form its own space causing the most dominant actor to act appropriately against the deviant actor. Cooperation, like manipulation is habitual behaviour, however unlike manipulation it is guaranteed to ensure capital gained as it supports the dominant structure of the field and adheres to the doxa. The EU, as the most dominant actor can then attribute capital to actors who act cooperatively, like the UK, who it feels have supported the structures and doxic norms of the field. However, cooperation is also linked to doxa as it is an adherence to the relations of order (Bourdieu, 1984). The discourse of the field, by analysing a large cross section of documents produced by actors of the field, will be examined to illustrate how one, or two, behaviours be they doxical or habitual can be present at any one time.

Conclusions

In conclusion the theoretical frameworks that have been illustrated in this chapter highlight the growing need to analyse how external migration control effects the management and creation of mechanisms as well as the relationships between actors beyond the confines of IR theory, instead an interdisciplinary approach adapting theories to complement existing theoretical frameworks extends our understanding of international relations and the subject area of IR. Speech act theory especially lacks the subtlety of using a theoretical framework like field theory. If this research had just used a standard Constructivist approach the outcomes would have been an acknowledgment that securitization is present, but conclusions that are not unique. Using with field theory allows for a number of behaviours to be identified within complex relationships. Manipulation and cooperation are not easily identifiable just using Constructivist frameworks. To analyse the complexity of international relations and that of the external migration control field, Bourdieu offers the theoretical understanding to uniquely approach the behaviours of actors in the external migration control field.

In the next chapter the methodological approach will be discussed in relation to the aims and questions of this research.

The Methodological Framework:

The Creation of the Field of Analysis

This chapter will outline the research design of this thesis detailing the strategy of engagement with the data and how the data has been collected and analysed. The chapter will be made up of three sections; Methodological Approach, Data Collection and Data Analysis. The first section will introduce the broader methodological framework of the research as well as detailing how it corresponds to the theory and concepts of the research. The second section is a detailed illustration of how the data was captured. Finally, the third section will be a comprehensive discussion of the data analysis.

From Theory to Research

This section will specify the broad approach of this research, outlining the research questions and the influence of the theory on the methodological framework. The key objective of this research is to understand whether the UK uses EU external migration control mechanisms to its own advantage or is simply adhering to these mechanisms as part of wider community norms. The research question is: How does the UK engage with EU external migration control structures and how does this impact on its relationship with the EU?

This research question was chosen, firstly, as it allows for the exploration of multilevel external migration control governance and mechanisms. To fully explore how the UK engages with the field of external migration control it is important to see how it does this bilaterally as well as multilaterally, directly through policy or through mechanisms such as Frontex. A wider exploration such as this allows for a more detailed analysis of a number of documents to identify to what extent securitization, manipulation and cooperation occur. This has supported and developed the theoretical framework as the question creates the field that is to be analysed, that of the external migration control field. The establishment of the field is crucial as it secures what the rules of the game are and the possible challenges that actors could face within the field if they do not adhere to these rules. Secondly, this research questions identifies the core actors that will be analysed within this research, which are the UK and the EU. Their relationship is important as the multifaceted nature of external migration control means that the relationship must be stable enough to ensure the rules of the field are followed. Their relationship is also dependent on the quality of the governance alongside the impact of any mechanisms, across national and regional structures.

Research regarding external migration control in the EU over the past few decades has focused on securitization. Purely concentrating on the securitization of external migration controls and mechanism can lead to the perpetuation of that narrative. By creating a research question that allows for the investigation of all areas of engagement in controls and mechanism, it opens up the possibilities of differing behaviours beyond that of just securitization. Small pilot tests of the Frontex quarterly and annual reports demonstrated that an investigation beyond securitization was needed. For example the UK's participation in Joint Operations could simply be viewed as a securitizing behaviour, however, when viewed in a wider understanding of external migration control norms, it could also be understood as direct cooperation which juxtaposes the standard narrative that the UK distances itself from EU practices. Which is why a broad research question was identified that had the scope to reveal more than just one behaviour.

The weakness in just examining the securitization processes of external migration control is that you miss the complexities of the relationships that play out within the field. The historical importance of building norms and how these impact upon modern day policy making is so often missed in contemporary research when examining the external migration control practices of the UK and how this impacts upon its relationship with the most dominant actors, especially the EU as the most dominant actor in the field. By examining policies and practices that make up the external migration control field with a lens that is wider than just securitization you can begin to piece together a more realistic picture of how the UK engages with the field and the actors within it.

The field of analysis for this research is the area of external migration control. This field was identified as it holds a unique collection of actors and norms. The most dominant actor in this field is the EU, from the Treaty of Rome onwards the EU (and as its previous incarnation as the EEC) have sought to control and dictate how migration from outside the EU is controlled. This has been reiterated throughout the policies changes that have been made, in particular after the introduction of the third pillar in the Maastricht Treaty. Other actors in the field are made of member states, organisations such as Frontex, and neighbouring states to the EU. These actors, including the EU become the units of analysis. The rest of this section will now break down each element of how the theory has built the methodological framework.

A field is primarily "a social arena within which struggles or manoeuvres take place over specific resources or stakes and access to them" (Jenkins, 2002, page 84). Field theory allows a researcher to specify a particular area of social interaction taking into account historical and current relationships to understand and in the case of this research it allow the analysis to view how the UK engages with external migration control. Actors create the field deforming the space and inserting their own

structures then the actions taken effect the relationships of actors within the field (Bourdieu, 2005). Behaviours are widely controlled by the most dominant actor in the field, in context to this research is the EU. I have achieved this by identifying what makes the external migration control field unique in terms of its content, structure and logic. The field is a "structured system of social positions" (Jenkins, 2002, page 85) and to understand these positions one must identify the system of forces which exist between points.

This research has identified policy documentation as a system of forces that create and reinforce positions for actors within the field of external migration control and how political policies maintain a system of force. Policy documentation is key in illustrating the doxa and the habitus of a field. Bourdieu explains habitus as an "acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted" (Bourdieu, 1977, page 95). Policy documentation is a "generative scheme" in which the external migration control field is maintained. Political policy is something that needs mutual agreement and cooperation in a field. The key element of habitus is that it disposes actors to take certain actions which are informed by past experiences and are calculated on the possible gain. In relation to this research habitus explains why UK policy documentation does or does not adhere to EU norms in context to migration control. This thesis explores if habitual practices through the external migration control field do in fact dispose the UK to adopt particular measures in context to Mediterranean migration control. This research also explores what happens to the structure of the field if the historical constructed norms of the field are compromised by actors. This will be explored further in the Data Analysis section of this chapter.

Actors are constantly concerned with their position within a field whether that be preserving it or improving it. Bourdieu (1977) explains that the concept of capital is key in analysing what is at stake for actors within a field. "The state is the culmination of a process of concentration of different species of capital" Bourdieu, 1998, page 41). Capital can come in a variety of forms Bourdieu identifies economic, social, cultural and symbolic as the most prominent. However, Adler-Nissen identifies that if you analyse fields at an interstate level, actors can exchange "normal" sources of capital for diplomatic capital that is maintained by historically constructed legitimacy which makes any behaviour by that actor within the field look "natural" (Alder-Nissen, 2011). Historically legitimated diplomatic capital is a useful marker in which to analyse the relationship between actors in a field. In particular, an actor such as the UK, as it no longer as economically powerful as it was say 50 years ago however it is extremely dominant in terms of its diplomatic power because of its previous position as a colonial power. This research is analysing how the capital the UK holds effects its relationships within the external migration control field. Its powerful historically constructed position has the ability for it to manipulate the field and potentially adjust the habitual behaviours of the actors within the field even

if it challenges the most dominant actor, the EU. This behaviour has been assessed using the coding framework that will be demonstrated in greater detail later in the chapter.

The ability to adjust the field is evidence of manipulation of the UK's position within the field. This is identified by analysing the policy documentation and illustrating the linguistic markers which show that the UK has greater political say in the direction of external migration control policy. However, the concept of doxa has also informed the research question which highlight the proposition that the UK adheres to external migration control field norms more than has previously been considered.

The concepts of habitus and capital are central to Bourdieu's Field Theory, however there is another concept which gives further insight into the practices of actors within a field and how these practices maintain and/or adjust the structures. Doxa is used by Bourdieu to understand "pre-reflexive" behaviours (Deer, 2008). What Deer means by "pre-reflexive" is that doxical behaviour is completely unconscious or what Bourdieu explains as "what is taken for granted" (Bourdieu, 1977). This concept has informed the research questions of this project that explore the notion that the UK does support external migration control policies. This thesis argues that the support the UK shows is not necessarily explicit but has been constructed from many years of negotiation which has informed the research in two ways. Firstly, it has developed the timeframe in which the documentation has been taken from. The conception of an external migration control field is founded in the Treaty of Rome (1958) therefore investigations and analysis begin at this point. The Treaty of Rome established a benchmark of how European migration should be managed therefore every policy thereafter has significance because it alters the norms of the field. Secondly, it has advised the type of documentation that has been chosen to analyse. Policy documentation highlights whether the UK follows EU migration control field norms from the conception of a policy or if the EU is a later consideration for UK policy makers.

Bourdieu informs the research in relation to structures and relationships however his theories do not suffice when analysing policy documentation. Discourse analysis is far more suited to understanding the language of the policy documentation and complements the structural understanding that Bourdieu offers. As has previously been discussed Speech Acts are important in the production of securitization language. This theory analyses the reaction of states and institutions in relation to a particular event and the intersubjective relationship between the threat, the agent and the audience (Wæver et al, 1993). However, what the theory fails to give a researcher is the tools to analyse documents. This is why the application of discourse analysis has been so important in this research.

Larsen (2004) discusses the use of discourse analysis to gain insight into EU foreign policy. "Across EU documents a discourse can be identified according to which the Union is constructed as a unit which defends its own interests and has an obligation to take on responsibilities in the light of international

challenges" (Larsen, 2004). The unique language of the EU allows this research to better understand that when the discourse changes it must be in relation to a common perceived threat. This complements using Bourdieusian analysis as shifts in established language potentially could adjust the habitus of the field. Adjustment in the habitus effects all the actors within it and potentially its behaviour towards external threats such as migration.

Discourse analysis also reinforces the way in which the field is examined. Common discourse is one key element in establishing a field and its external relations. "The ways in which other regions around Europe can be seen as contributing to constituting EU identity in EU discourse through 'othering' is manifested in EU policies towards these regions" (Larsen, 2004). One of the key features of a field is when it ceases to have any impact and it fails to be recognised as a field (Jenkins, 2002). Policy documentation illustrates firstly EU identity and also how far reaching the field is in terms of its foreign policy reach.

As McCourt (2011) has argued in his article *Rethinking Britain's Role in the World* discourse is key in maintaining external relationships. He discusses how discourse has shaped the UKs position in world politics and where in the international field the UK is. McCourt argues that the UK encourages its position as an EU protagonist as it leverages more power as a diplomatic "floater" between the US and the EU (McCourt, 2011). He uses press releases to illustrate how the UK likes to be viewed as a diplomatic powerhouse in the field of political power. However, press releases are often written by PR representatives or are highly orchestrated by politicians. It is not sufficient enough evidence to show how international relations is maintained. Policy documentation illustrates how political and historical structures influence policy conception and creation.

Methodological Approach: Qualitative versus Quantitative

In order to apply the above theory this research uses a mixture of both methods, however, the predominant approach will be qualitative. "Qualitative research simply requires a broader and less restrictive concept of 'design'" (Maxwell, 2008, page 215). Unlike quantitative research which is a strict set of predetermined structures qualitative research offers a "looser" set of structures in which to undertake research. This research is predominantly qualitative because of the nature of the research questions. The questions centre on relationships between international actors. Moses and Knutsen (2012) argue that an actor's behaviour can be influenced by interactions which are deemed meaningful by that actor.

Anselm Strauss (1987) advocates the use of a diverse range of material in order to improve analysis and gain a deeper understanding of a subject. With this in mind this project combines a qualitative

analysis with an element of quantitative data analysis which has allowed for the research questions to be answered in greater detail. Coffey and Atkinson (1996) and Denzin and Lincoln (2005) agree that a qualitative research design is inherently multi method. "QUAL + quan, a qualitatively driven project, with a qualitative core and quantitative simultaneous components" (Richards, 2013, page 93). This approach means that both components are not equally weighted, one provides the analytical core and the other provides insight and contextual explanation alongside the findings from the qualitative analysis. Policies and documents from actors such as Frontex (quarterly and annual reports) and the ENP contain quantitative data alongside qualitative material therefore a researcher needs to adopt a method in which to combine the two approaches. A multi method approach allows the data to be triangulated. Denzin (2006) illustrated methodological triangulation allows for different methods to be utilised as way of verifying findings within the data. Comparing the securitization language of the qualitative data to the number of migrants crossing the Mediterranean means any findings within the qualitative material can be verified. For example, if rising securitization is present in the language of a document that rise could be simply because of a rise in the number of migrants entering the EU.

Huberman and Miles (1984) discuss distinct processes of qualitative analysis, one being data reduction. If this thesis was to include every bit of data concerning migration in the European region over the past 60 years, it would be a large undertaking that would take many years. Data reduction can be achieved through conceptual frameworks and refining research questions. This then reduces the amount of data to analyse as the specificity of the research questions make only a small number of documents valid for analysis, it is able to summarise a large amount of data (Huberman and Miles, 1994 and Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998). EU migration data is extremely wide and varied, without reducing the data to more specific categories vast amounts of it would be irrelevant.

Huberman and Miles (1984) second process of data analysis is data display. Unlike quantitative analysis being able to visualise what you discover within documents is extremely difficult. Something that can be solved through the third process of qualitative data analysis which is conclusion drawing and verification. This is where a researcher can interpret the data and draw meaning from it. The data can also be analysed for comparisons and contrasting cases where a researcher can explain and note significant themes and patterns. In terms of this research conclusion drawing and verification will come after the coding of the data which will be discussed further later in the chapter. Here is where you can draw up visual diagrams of your data through charts signifying the differences or similarities throughout the data. From this point the data can then be explored either deductively or inductively.

This research is using a deductive approach; "deductive explanation moves in the opposite direction [to that of induction], in that a particular situation is explained by deduction from a general statement

about the circumstances" (Flick, 2007, page 4-5). A deductive approach begins with having an established theory and conceptual framework. This conceptual framework informs the research questions which then drives the data collection and analysis.

The theoretical framework which has influenced the methodological approach is centrally constructivist. Ontological diversity and complexity means that constructivists draw on more resources and evidence than a positivist researcher (Moses and Knutsen, 2012). As we have already discussed employing qualitative and quantitative methods ensures deeper analysis. Constructivism however not only attempts to understand the subject but also the researcher. Constructivists (such as Guba and Lincoln (1989) who will be discussed below) highlight that "no knowledge is completely value-free… there is a difference between pure partisan politics and intellectual understanding and scientific knowledge" (Jackson et al, 2003, page 250). The research design reflects these considerations when choosing the data and in what ways that data has been analysed.

Intersubjectivity is important for any researcher to consider. We all view things differently and that is determined by social/contextual backgrounds and or presuppositions. No researcher just experiences the world objectively. This research is being undertaken by a natural born British citizen therefore it had the potential to be bias to the political position of the UK. In order to overcome intersubjectivity as a researcher you must be aware of its potential negative influences. This can be achieved by using a broader set of epistemological tools such as empathy or authority (Moses and Knutsen, 2012).

Data Collection

In this thesis the collection of the data has been based upon a list of keywords derived from the literature and the research questions. Miles and Huberman (1984) explain that the conceptual framework has a profound effect on the data collection. They argue that as a researcher you have gathered a knowledge of the phenomena you are studying therefore you have an intuition about where to find relevant data. This is the way in which data collection was managed in the case of this project. An initial set of keywords were created in order to guide the beginning of the data collection. They were used to search through government and institutional databases and archives. Keywords such as; borders, (im)migration and external were used to search for data within the timeframes of the Maastricht Treaty (1992), the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) and the UK Immigration Act (2014). These timeframes were identified as key junctures where the key actors of this research, the UK and the EU, gained or lost capital in the field of external migration controls. These keywords and the timeframes which they searched within were informed by the literature review and initial exploration in to the data that would be used for the research. The expansive results that came from such searches signified a need to define the search terms by either using phrases or combinations of words to refine the

results such as "immigration security" or "external migration control", for example. Although these phrases (among others) still offered a large amount of data, what the results did offer was a sign posting to the databases and sources that could be used, as well as the current social debates surrounding migration in Europe and the UK, such as the current Immigration Bill (2014) in the UK. The research questions reflect a specificity in what data is relevant to the research. When used to search the databases they produced a reduced number of 'hits', however the data that they did return was more valuable in terms of content. In order to provide a detailed account of all the data that was collated from these searches as well as more specific searches for institutional or state specific databases the remainder of this section will be split between the UK, the EU and other sources of data.

The UK

There are three online data sources the first being www.legislation.gov.uk. This catalogue holds all of the statutory laws and general acts passed by UK government and also the amendments attached to these laws from the original Immigration Act of 1971 to amendments made on the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act (2009). The advanced search allows you refine your search by year or by UK public general acts or UK statutory instruments. A simple search of immigration however gives you instant access to the 200 legislative documents that the database holds. The majority of records are available on downloadable pdf files or can be viewed on the website. Examples of which are; Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009, Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006, Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, Immigration Act 1988 and the Immigration Act 1971

The examples illustrate a number of differing pieces of legislation that are within the database. When accessing through the website you can navigate to each subsection of the act which makes analysis quicker. Coding of acts is relatively simple because of their structure and language. This is especially true of UK immigration acts as they tend to be a progression of the previous act. However, this can also be a pitfall of coding documents that are linked. Acts will reference previous version in order to illustrate that there has been no change in that section of the legislation, however it can cause a researcher to code a document twice. In order to overcome this, a research journal will keep track on the documents that have been already coded and one can simply refer back to the journal to check. Documents such as these will be coded alongside the EU legislative acts to investigate what national level mechanisms the UK uses to construct control over migration in the Mediterranean.

The second catalogue is www.official-documents.gov.uk which holds the records and publications from virtually every executive agency in the UK including the UKBA, Foreign and Home Office. This catalogue holds both detailed quantitative and qualitative data about migrants in the UK. Statistics from the National Statistics Office are one of the most reliable sources of quantitative data. Access to

the data is completely free of charge and available through the website. Documents are downloadable through the website in Word, Excel, PowerPoint or pdf or available to view through the website. Like other online databases searches are either achieved through a simple search or an advanced search in which you can refine searches by year, topic, department or official document status. Examples of the data after using the search term (EU migration) are; Statement of changes to the Immigration Rules: HC1138 (2014), UK/Belgium: Agreement concerning immigration controls on the Channel Tunnel (2013), Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner annual report and accounts 2012 to 2013 (2013), Draft Immigration Bill (2009) and the Control of immigration: statistics United Kingdom (2003).

These examples illustrate the breadth of data that is available on this database. Unlike its counterpart of www.legisalation.gov.uk the intrinsic detail of the preparatory papers compliments the final pieces of legislative documentation. This list also shows the differing types of data on offer for a researcher for example the *Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner annual report and accounts 2012 to 2013* (2013) and the *Control of immigration: statistics United Kingdom* (2003) are quantitative data which will give contextual understanding the research. A large number of qualitative documents in this database are statements of change. Analysing these using my code *reactive policy making by the UK* will help to pin point if these changes are reactions to increases in the number of migrants or political event. (Detailed information regarding the structure of the codes of this research will be discussed at length in the following section *Data Analysis.*)

The third catalogue is UK Treaties Online (https://www.gov.uk/uk-treaties or http://treaties.fco.gov.uk/treaties/treaty.htm;jsessionid=AA1E3702496B37F54046A3CCADA836F5) which is run by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. This catalogue holds the multiple treaties that the UK holds with Commonwealth states and the EU as well as many other unilateral and bilateral agreements. The records within this catalogue are dated from 1934 to 2013 and are available in pdf format to download or view online. It stores the EU documentation in a particular series called the European Union Series within it are multilateral agreements between member states of the EU, or between third parties and member states of the EU that are not yet in force for the UK. Previous to 1st April 2011 the series was called the European Communities series. There are two main ways to search the database. The first is a simple search of keywords the other is an advanced search where you can search via treaty type, year of adoption, signatories and entry into force. The catalogue gives great insight into the exact details of UK treaties with the EU, member states and treaties with third parties which may not be so evident when performing a direct comparison of the legislation. However, this database only holds "European Union Series" data from 2013 onwards and currently has no data on human migration, after a substantial search of the database it was found it had no relevant data. If

this research was to be repeated or developed, then this catalogue would be a worthwhile database to explore.

One of the other sources used for data from the UK is Portcullis. Portcullis is the Parliamentary Archive Catalogue and holds many differing types of data source to analyse. Access to Portcullis is firstly achieved by using the online archive to search through the documents. The search engine within the website offers a simplistic mode of data reduction in which you can then view the titles of the documents. Many different documents are held including committee's decisions, private letters between MP's, letters between the UK and other states concerning immigration, immigration case files, to name but a few. These records are snap shots of the discussions within parliament at the time when crucial legislation was passing through. One positive of Portcullis is the relative ease of gaining access. Once you have identified the documents you email the archive with the documents you wish to have access to. Access can be granted within two working days and with access to twelve records at a time. Within the catalogue there are two types of archive; open and closed. Open archives are free to view by request; closed archives are only obtainable through a Freedom of Information request and legally have to be processed within 20 days.

These are two of examples of the data available: "*HL/PO/CO/EU/F/11/24 - SCR: Report from the Commission on a Dialogue for migration, mobility and security with the southern Mediterranean countries (Document No 10784/11). Letter of 16 June 2011 from Damian Green MP, Minister for Immigration, to Lord Roper, on the effects of migration in relation to the current situation in Libya*" (2011) is an example of how the data from Portcullis allows me to understand the decision making processes rather than simply analysing the piece of legislation in isolation. A letter between politicians is more revealing than an isolated policy as it reveals the narrative and contextualises decisions that have been made.   Another example of the data illustrating more than just legislation is *HL/PO/CO/EU/F/7/26 - Who will patrol Europe's border? Why can't Europe's promised border controls come to Malta's help in coping with the great exodus from Africa? Malta suffers setback in bid for burden-sharing on immigration* (2006). This document demonstrates the position of the UK with the EU structure in a number of ways. It demonstrates the relationships between the UK and other member states, which is not always explicit in legislation. The content is centred on the international relations between the UK (and the EU respectively) and African states. Considerations such as these would not be taken into account if the project focused solely on legislative data. Using an archive catalogue could also lead to uncovering data that may not have been uncovered or had not been considered as important through early data collection.

There are some limitations of Portcullis as a source of data. Firstly, the 'closed' records can only be opened through a Freedom of Information request. Legally the requests have to be processed within 20 days however the requests can be denied. During the data collection process of this project no requests were rejected and all documentation was accessed with ease. The second limitation is the age of many of the records. The majority of the records (over three quarters of them) are older than ten years which does not discount them completely but they are less useful. Newer documentation can be found elsewhere on the websites www.legislation.gov.uk and www.official-documents.gov.uk. Overall the use of Portcullis as a source of data is a positive as it will expand the knowledge base beyond what data is readily available on websites.

The EU has a number of databases that store legislative data to statistical data alongside data from each EU institution agency or body. In this section each three major databases will be discussed (Eur-Lex, Eurostat and the European Union Open Data Portal) as well as examples of the documentation within them and how they relate to the research questions. Each database is accessed differently so it will be outlined how they were accessed, how they are navigated and some of the negative experiences of using them.

The Eur-Lex database (eur-lex.europa.eu/en/index.htm) is a comprehensive catalogue of all legislative items published by the EU. The data that is available is the complete catalogue of EU law as well as the preparatory acts, case law and international agreements. As well as the legislative data it also gives the user access to the *Official Journal of the European Union.* Access to the databases requires simple registration through the website which gives you a username and password each time you wish to access it. The obtainability of the data is relatively simple. An example of a search could be TE (Text) IMMGRATION AND UK. This search produces 1111 search results which can then be refined by specific queries such as year, subdomains (legislature, preparatory acts, and consolidated law etcetera), author or the type of act. The search TI (Title) IMMIGRATION AND UK produces only 11 results, which reflects that those pieces of data are more specific than those which only have these keywords in the title.

Different syntaxes can be used to create different data sets which can then be saved for future reference. The simple search was used to understand the amount of data that was held, searching the work *immigration* produced 9448 results which indicated that it would hold a large amount of data to analyse. Once a single document has been chosen to view the databases assigns it specific 'classifications' which can include, *migration control, return migration, EC fund* and *area of freedom*

and security. By clicking on these links the database then gives you everything that is stored under that classification.

Having access to opinions, resolutions, proposals and decisions to the varying projects and legislative decisions made by the EU will increase the scope of my knowledge not only of the existing EU legislation but also of the decision making processes. Unlike the data sources for the UK, Eur-Lex provides the data in one place unlike UK data which is spread across four different catalogues this has made accessing the data more time efficient. The data also has a wide time frame making it suitable for a comparative analysis. A small limitation of the Eur-Lex is that some of the records are not in English, however, these are few and any that cannot be read are available elsewhere within the EU in an English translation or at request to the Eur-Lex helpdesk (eurlex-helpdesk@publications.europa.eu).

Eurostat is another database in which statistical information can be obtained. Unlike Eur-Lex and the European Union Open Data Portal the data is purely quantitative. Their remit covers a large number of the key areas of EU policy. Agriculture, Population, Trade and Industry are just some of the key areas in which they hold data. More importantly they have large data sets in relation to immigration in the region. Datasets include basic data on the number of migrants in the region as a whole as well as per member state. Other more complex datasets include *change of immigration status permits by reason and citizenship, immigration by sex, age group and country of previous residence* and *Immigration by sex, age group and country of birth.* The data is also in tabular form however the data base also has the ability to create graphs based on the data you wish to use or it allows you to create your own.

The use of Eurostat in the overall design has been to add contextual understanding and give quantitative support to the rest of the data. The European Union Open Data Portal is another database which as offered peripheral information on the everyday workings of the institutions, bodies and agencies that make up the EU. It is in its early stages of development and is an attempt to bring together a number of member state as well as regional level databases, including Eur-Lex and Eurostat. At the moment data from the portal is exactly the same as that in the Eurostat database, however if this research was to be repeated or revised in the future it may be an invaluable source of more qualitative and quantitative data.

The data available from Frontex is both qualitative and quantitative. The specific documents that have been analysed are the FRAN Quarterly Updates (Frontex Risk Analysis Network) and the Frontex Annual Risk Analysis. There are fourteen documents to date that detail the exact number of migrants

that have crossed the EU's southern border. The data is broken down into different categories. These categories include;

•   Detections of Illegal Border Crossings which is subcategorised in to routes and the country of origin of the migrants.

•   Detections of Facilitators - subcategorised by nationality.

•   Detections of Illegal Stay - subcategorised by nationality.

•   Refusals of Entry - subcategorised by nationality.

•   Reasons for Refusal of Entry

•   Third-Country nationals effectively returned to third countries - subcategorised by type of return for example forced or voluntary.

The quarterly reports and the annual reports were produced from 2009 onwards allowing for a direct comparison between not only on an annual basis but on a quarterly basis. The reports are not simply statistical records of the movement of people into the EU from the south. The document also has many other sources of information that can be analysed. One of these are illustrations (for example maps) of the movement of migrants, what states need visas to enter the UK and illustrations on the changing number of third country nationals trying to enter the EU. The qualitative information the annual and quarterly reports hold data on the language that is used when EU agencies discuss migration words such as threat, risk, clandestine, tactics and surveillance to name just a few. Frontex informs the research of the UK taking part in policing operations in the Mediterranean. Evidence such as this illustrate the UK using EU mechanism to control migration in the region. Information on Frontex operations are also of great value because many of these operations are completed alongside particular member states that have a history of securitizing against migration and using stricter controls such as Greece and Italy (frontex.europa.eu). The frequency and the cost of the operations can be analysed to gain a detailed idea of how legislation and reports are translated into controlling actions. The limitations of this data are that official documentation of the operations are classified. Information about the operations on the Frontex website are limited to the basic actions of the operation, who took part and how much it cost. All other information surrounding the operations is limited to media or charity reports whose validity are questionable and not as easy to analyses. Use of these reports has only been for contextual information surrounding the Frontex operations.

The data for the ENP will be gathered through the same database as the EU legislation; Eur-Lex. However, the ENP website (ec.europa.eu) does contain detailed documents that outline the exact

bilateral agreements that the EU has with states that have signed up to the ENP. It also has access to short and long term reports in terms of the EU's relationship with Egypt, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia. Current agreements alongside documentation outlining EU initiatives in these states such as New EU support to Libya for economic integration and human rights (21st November, 2013) are key to understanding the EU's relationship with the North African states that are part of the ENP. It also unveils a large number of documents to analyse. Documentation from other departments of the European Commission such as EuropeAid and the delegation department are linked with these projects which opens the analysis wider than simply the obvious migration documents. By analysing a wide range of documentation from relative areas of the EU a deeper explanation can be given to the extent of how much migration controls (re)structure the sovereignty of the region. In terms of the UK's (re)structuring documentation of laws and policies, including consultation papers and amendments to the act, these documents can be found at gov.uk through a simple search engine using words like 'immigration', 'security' and 'citizenship'.

The sources that have been discussed are not without fault. The largest issue to overcome is that there was not a wide enough range of data to confirm whether or not (re) structuring is occurring through migration control in the Euro-Med region. To overcome this the codes needed to be specific enough in order to thoroughly understand the (re)structuring processes as well as discovering them in the first place. A more practical issue with this data is the proportion of it which is in French only, in particular documents that outline current activities that the EU is taking part in with the region and specific North African states. This was overcome by applying to the EU to have the documents translated into English. The EU Council, Commission and Parliament are obligated to provide documents under the Charter of Fundamental Rights (Article 42) and in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Article 15(3)). The length of time it takes for the EU to respond to such requests was not available however the number of documents that needed to be translated were relatively small so this was not too damaging to the research.

Data Analysis

The concept of coding and the rationale of adopting it as the method of analysis was discussed under the section *Methodological Approach*. However, what has not been discussed is the codes that will be specifically used for this project. This section will be a detailed insight to the coding framework. However, the first section is a broader discussion of how coding was chosen as the method of analysis.

"Analysis is a process of resolving data into its constituent components to reveal their characteristic themes and patterns" (Dey, 1993, page 8). Dey identifies three processes as key for analysing qualitative data are describing, classifying and collecting. The language is very similar to that of

quantitative data analysis. Like Huberman and Miles (1984), Dey defines analysis of qualitative data as a clear, identifiable and distinct set of sub processes which are therefore systematic and developmental. The analysis of qualitative data is important to structure in this way because it gives the research a clear set of objectives.

Wolcotts (1994) takes a more extreme approach when analysing qualitative data. He takes his analysis a step further by demonstrating that qualitative data can be 'transformed'. He advocates that instead of finding descriptions in the data that the data should speak for itself and that if a researcher aims to 'pull' descriptions out of the data that it may not be accurate as you cannot have a 'pure' description of data. He also claims that interpretations are unbounded and finding key factors and relationships is the most important factor in qualitative data analysis. Wolcotts also identifies that the processes of data analysis are not always mutually exclusive and can be done in a variety of different ways in which different conclusions can be drawn. "The identification of analytical themes and the fragmentation of the data in accordance with an emergent conceptual scheme are widespread among the researchers and the relevant literature" (Coffey and Atkins, 1996, page 23). Fielding and Fielding (1986) remark there is often more than one way to skin a cat and these processes can be applied to a number of different qualitative data analysis techniques.

Qualitative coding put simply is about linking concepts and data whilst assigning labels and tags to data based on concepts and theories (Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000). The two academics that have been given accolade of mainstreaming qualitative coding give the definition of coding as: "The discovery of theory from data – systematically obtained and analysed in social research" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, page 1). The process of applying labels and tags is in fact not the analysis the analysis comes from the investigation and dissection of what the codes produce. "Attaching codes to data and generating concepts have important functions in enabling us rigorously to review what our data is saying" (Coffey and Atkins, 1996, page 27). Coding can link the different segments or instances in the data which are then pulled together to create categories of data that we think have a common property or element which may or may not relate or are about a particular theme or topic. What is most important is how we use these codes to analyse the data. Coding can help to generate ideas that are precisely linked to the data.

Coding is not a way of developing conceptual frameworks as they should already be in place in order to accurately code the data. Rather coding can be thought of as a range of approaches that aid the organization, retrieval and interpretation of data" (Coffey and Atkins, 1996, page 27). Coding is often the easiest way of simplifying or reducing the amount of data that you analyse. As you retrieve and coding the data it goes into an index which can be organised by specific codes, themes or theories.

Throughout the coding process it enables a researcher to go back over very particular segments of that data without having to go through the whole document again. Coffey and Atkins (1996) also argue that coding can be a form of data complication. Not in a negative sense but insofar as the coding process can expand and transform the data which in turn opens up more analytical roots than first predicted. However realistically coding data is often a mixture of data simplification and data complication.

The three main processes involved in coding are firstly, noticing relevant phenomenon. Before the coding process begins the research questions created during the research design process will give an idea of the phenomena that is to be looked for within the data. However occasionally when coding the data, it can reveal other phenomena that the researcher may not have foreseen. This is remedied simply by creating a new code that includes new phenomena ensuring that it is relevant to the coding framework already in place. Secondly the researcher must then collect examples of them identifying passages and ensuring that they are thematically linked together and indexed. Thirdly analyse the indexed passages to find patterns, differences and structures within the data. It is not just a case of the number of times these phenomena occur and counting them but viewing them as part of a mechanism in a much wider process. In the case of this project one would code the data, index and identify the associations between data from the UK and data from the EU.   Coding opens up the data in order to interrogate the data further. One could say it goes beyond the data and allows a researcher to think creatively with the data by asking of it questions. Using coding is heuristic and provides unique way in which a researcher can interact and think about the data. Gibbs et al (2007) understands this process as analysing narratives that are within the data. "The analysis of narratives… adds a new dimension to qualitative research" (Gibbs et al, 2007, page 71). Applying this idea to this research, the data has within it a historical narrative. Understanding the historical narrative of migration in Europe is also connected to the constructive understanding of the object of the research.

The creation of codes can occur before the coding process as well as during. This project uses concept driven codes. These are codes that are created from the research literature, previous studies as well personal hunches that a researcher may have (Gibbs et all, 2007). Codes that are concept driven are called In vivo codes that are "codes that derive from the terms and language used by the social actors in the field" (Coffey and Atkins, 1996, page 30). It is described as a bottom up approach that derives the categories from the context of the data (Coffey and Atkins, 1996). Transforming coded data into meaningful data that can be analysed is perhaps the most important part of the coding process. "The establishment of ordered relationships between codes and concepts is a significant starting point for reflection" (Coffey and Atkins, 1996, page 48). In order to accurately transform coded data there must be a distinct framework in which you analyse the data.

Hutchinson et al (2010) discussed the evolution of the design must come from the development of the codes and of the theoretical framework the basis of which must come from an understanding of the contextual background of the research subject. Strauss discusses that codes are not simply categories but must be created to give the researcher a wide picture, in what Strauss calls the coding paradigm;

"While coding involves the discovery and naming of categories, it must also tell the researcher much more than that… Whether explicit or implicit, it functions as a reminder to code data for relevance to whatever phenomena are reference by a given category, for the following:

Conditions

Interactions among the actors

Strategies and tactics

Consequences"

Strauss, Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists, 1987, page 27-28

Strauss in detail outlines how to look out for each part of the category in the language used. Such as, when looking for conditions words such as "because," "since," and "as" (Strauss, 1987) are key identifiers in what could be categorised as conditions. Although Strauss applies these details to the analysis of interviews the premises of the paradigm are the same if you apply it to other areas of research. The categories that Strauss has outlined above give a structure to the process. In short a coding paradigm contextualisation of the data that identifies relationships between the context and the process (Corbin and Strauss, 2008, page 89).

Bernstein discusses codes as "regulators of the relationships between contexts, and through those relationships, regulators of relationships within contexts" (1990, page 101). As Harker (1993) argues the link Bernstein's idea of codes and Bourdieu's concept of habitus allows for a solid foundation of analysis. Habitus is a form of social subjectivity (Bourdieu, 1977) and codes allow for an analysis of how that subjectivity has been created as well as analysing how that subjectivity effects relationships within the social constructs in which that subjectivity was created.

Like the work of Stevens et al in the article *Priming time for Blair? Media Priming, Iraq, and leadership evaluations in Britain* (2011) the conceptual definitions have had a direct impact on the codes that have been used. Their research is an excellent example of creating codes based upon the theoretical and conceptual ideas of a research project. They seek to understand the effect of media priming of the Iraq war in the 2005 election and use the coverage of a number of British media outlets to see if

the coverage could possibly have had an effect on the results of the election. It is a unique combination of content analysis alongside a tracking of the public opinion through the YouGov questionnaire results and opinion polls. The analysis is relatively basic, the codes were *bad news, good news* and *mixed news* in which the authors ascribed value to each code and crossed referenced it with the "respondents self-reported readerships of the newspapers" (Stevens et al, 2011, page 549). By their own admission the research is extremely limited in so far as it only covers one election (Stevens et al, 2011) however what is does offer is a comprehensive approach to basing codes in the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of their work.

Starr and Most (1976) also illustrates the use of a conceptual framework to generate codes. They created a set of codes from International Relations literature regarding different bordering practices of states. They used codes such as *contiguous land borders* and *200-mile limit water borders* in order to identify the different types of borders that exist within the literature. This has informed this project by illustrating that coding can be used to identify specific concepts through the analysis and that coding can be used to build existing theories. For example, a code may illustrate how the UK adjusts its habitual practices to gain a more dominant position in the field of EU migration control. However, they limit their data to International Relations literature. Abbott and Snidal (2000) have influence this project by using legislation and institutional literature unlike the projects that have been discussed. They approached their data the same way as this project by seeking examples of where states and institutions stray from constructed norms. This has been identified by using historical documentation and constructing what the EU and UK norms are in context to migration. They do not use a coding framework and this is a weakness within their research. Coding offers a distinct and through analysis by allowing a researcher to ask questions of data rather than take it at face value.

Coding the large number of documents that make up the data of this research means a strict method of analysis is needed. Richards (2005) offers a number of differing techniques in which to efficiently code large amounts of data. One such technique is "mechanical coding" (page 156) which is simply uses text searches to lead you to the more meaningful parts of the data. This works as a technique as long as the researcher is aware of slight differences to words and phrases or they could be missed from the analysis. It also is useful when a phenomenon that did not seem significant during the creation of the codes becomes apparent then it allows the researcher access text in relation to that phenomenon as quickly as possible. "Drag net coding" allows a researcher to test a simple text search to be tested by seeing if a word or phrase occurs in certain parts of the data or across a whole set of data. Drag net coding alongside data reduction techniques is how this research has. Text searches can help to test theories and it pulls different materials together from a range of data sets. Gibbs (2007) describes it as a way of thematically retrieving related parts of texts. Neither mechanical coding nor

drag net coding are interpretive they are simply techniques of instant retrieval. This research has used both these techniques to search documents. Microsoft Word and PDF readers have search functions it has allowed for efficient initial coding of the documents. Microsoft Word also has a function in which you can compare documents. This function is useful in context to this project as comparisons can be made between different policy documents especially UK legislation which is often has two versions; an original as enacted and a revised version. Basic text searches need suitable codes in order to make them useful. Keywords and phrases have already been discussed in terms of data collection therefore the rest of this section concentrates on the exact codes that are used. The end of the section will then be dedicated to the analysis of the data post-coding.

The first code is *policy acceleration*. *Policy acceleration* was identified by looking for key phrases in data such as management, implementation and increasing. This code has created an understanding of whether or not the number of migration control policies towards North Africa have been increasing. The code has been used in a number of differing ways. Firstly, it has been used to analyse UK data and then EU data, alongside breaking down the structures of these two actors further by examining specific agencies such as the UKVI or Frontex. It has allowed the researcher to identify the rate at which each actor is creating migration control policies and compare if the UK is accelerating policy creation beyond the EU rate of creation thus proving that the UK is creating national level mechanisms to construct control over the EU's southern border. Acceleration is also evidence of the (re)structuring of sovereignty by the UK and the EU.

The second code is *policy deceleration. Policy deceleration* was identified by looking for key words such as completion, reducing and decreasing. Much like the *policy acceleration* code it will examine all the same institutions and agencies but identifies policies that illustrate if the UK is decelerating policy creation and using EU mechanism to control migration in the Euro-Med region rather than using resources to create its own. Evidence of deceleration also illustrates that the UK and the EU are uninterested in (re)structuring sovereignty in the region.

The third code is *UK engagement with EU migration policy making for the Euro-Med area*. Evidence of this can be seen in the use of language such as "The UK believes…", "The UK will develop…" or the "The UK has…". This code was developed to understand how involved the UK is in the making of migration policy. This is evidence of the potential influence of migration control in the (re)structuring of sovereignty by the UK and the EU if they UK is actively engaging in the policy making then it has an interest in the effects of that policy on the structuring of sovereignty in the EU. It also gives evidence to answer the core research questions of *How does the UK manipulate the EU's southern border and*

North African Territory to control and securitize migration? as it measures the level of influence has over the creation of migration policy in the Euro-Med region.

The fourth code is *EU engagement with UK migration policy making*. This code was specifically developed for deconstructing the preparatory papers held in the UK concerning the development of migration policy. As discussed within the *Data Collection* chapter examination of the preparatory documentation of policies are often as revealing as the finalised piece of documentation. The influence of the EU is illustrated through their engagement with the creation on the policies through parliamentary committees alongside green and white papers. If the final policy reflects the influence that the EU applied during the process, then it is evidence that the UK does not extend its own sovereign control over North Africa and is aligned with the EU structure.

The fifth code is *reactive policy making by the UK* while the sixth code is *reactive policy making by the EU.* The fifth and sixth codes are linked as the evidence from each will be used to compare who is more likely to react to increases in numbers of migrants from North Africa or after a significant political event. An example of a linguistic marker that is evidence of reactive policy making would be "In reaction to…", "The recent situation…" or "Recent events…". Accurate data on the number of migrants from North Africa are taken from the FRONTEX quarterly and annual reports as they are the most up to date. To determine what a "large" spike was, an average number of migrants was calculated and when the average number increased by 1000 this was understood as a "spike". A significant political event was defined by the reaction of the UK or the EU. If an official statement was released by either actor, then this was deemed a significant political event such as 9/11 or the Arab Spring. Policies would also only be taken into consideration if they were within 6-9months of the increase in numbers or the political event.

Analysis is a constant throughout the coding process as you categorise your data by a codes frequency and/or its association with other data. Richards (2009) call this "coding on" a process in which you refine codes and categories. Sub categories are also an important part of the coding process as very often it is difficult to disseminate one code that has no relation to any of the others. It allows similar codes to be duplicated so when coding a document, it is thoroughly deconstructed. To make sense of the codes and their sub categories you can create coding maps in order to make sense of different overlapping codes, how they relate to one another, it often reveals that more specific codes are embedded in the more general codes. Without such an index it would be difficult to understand how the codes relate to one another. Codes are links between particular parts of data that one would not normally be able to relate, the codes are the tool in which to conceptualize and understand the gaps and connections in the data. However, when going through the coding process one has to be mindful

of the contextual narrative of the data. To overcome this, a simple coding journal would accurately navigate the codes and data that have been used over a period of which the research is being done (Richards, 2009 and Gibbs, 2007). A coding journal acts as a place in which all your notes are stored. It can also have a far more analytical role. It can be a vehicle for finding new phenomena as well as creating new codes.

Conclusions

This chapter has given a detailed overview of the research design for this project. The first section gave detailed insight into the how the theory and methodology literature have framed the design for this research. By understanding what Bourdieu, and academics that use his structures like Adler-Nissen, mean by power one can then create an analytical structure in which to find behaviours of actors within the data. The second section described the data collection process, detailing how data was collected and managed. The third section illustrates previous research, their influence on this project and how a detailed insight into how the specific coding framework of this research was constructed and utilised. The rest of this thesis will now demonstrate how the design was applied and what has been found from the analysis of the data.

From Welcome Workers to Security Threat

To understand the way in which migration is currently being controlled by the United Kingdom (UK) and the European Union (EU) we must first understand the historical journey of both actors in context to migration. Understanding the history of the policies and the historical context in which they were enacted compliments the research as it introduces and explains some of the key decisions that have led to more complex structures in current migration control. It also introduces the early indicators of the relationship between the UK and the EU that will be analysed later in the thesis. This chapter explores the establishment of the external migration control field throughout the latter half of the 20th century. A detailed understanding of these structures is needed to inform the use of Bourdieu and field theory and this will be explored in more detail throughout the chapter. It will also be a critical overview of how the UK and the EU has engaged with migration over the past 60 years since the end of World War 2 (WW2). There is some discussion of pre WW2 policies however as they illustrate the earliest state migration policies therefore reflecting the attitudes of actors as the external migration control field as it became established. In particular, this chapter will discuss the change in attitudes towards external migration into the region and how this change was reflected in policy development from active immigrant recruitment post war too controlled and often restricted migration from the mid-1970s onwards. This chapter will establish the historical connections between the actors of the external migration control field. In understanding the historical interactions between the actors the analysis that proceeds this chapter is contextualised. Bourdieu highlighted that a field is not a static structure, it is instead a process that is historically and culturally constructed so to understand the modern external migration control field you first need to look at its earliest conceptions (Adler-Nissen, 2013).

The first part of the chapter will be a discussion of post-WW2 migration in the European region with an examination of the policies of the France, Germany and the UK. The use of France and Germany is to illustrate the migration policies of the states in continental Europe as no regional structures or policies existed until 1957. Discussion of France and Germany post 1957 will be to allow a detailed comparison of the viewpoints of those contributing to the development of regional policies during the pre-Maastricht Treaty negotiations and the first established norms of the field. These two countries were chosen because of the influential role they played both in the conception of the EU and the power they then exercise within the EU now as the two of the largest economies in the region with

some of the highest population of migrants. The use of France and Germany is solely for the purpose of this chapter to add context to illustrate the similarities and differences as these states came together to negotiate regional migration policies.

The second part of the chapter will be an analysis of the key junctures in migration policy history including the policies (domestic and regional) and their historical context from 1957 onwards and how these events caused migration policy in the UK and Europe to develop from active recruitment to controlled migration. The key events in history that have been chosen because of their political significance either directly or indirectly on UK and Europe migration policy development. For example, one of the historical events that will be discussed is Enoch Powell's *Rivers of Blood* speech. This event has been chosen not just because of the ramifications of the speech on UK migration policy but also as an exemplification of the changing attitudes across Europe. Another event will be the Maastricht Treaty (1992) as this was the consolidation of many years of integration in the European region and migration was one of the key areas of negotiation. Another key event is the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) which enacts the Schengen Agreement and was the framework in which many current policies have been based upon such as the development of the migration control mechanism Frontex. The 3 examples of events that will be discussed are key to this research because they illustrate the relationship between the UK and the EU, how their histories have similarities and differences and how this has effected and informed current migration policy. These events will not be analysed in isolation but in a wider context of political and social dynamics in the region, which is why France and Germany have been chosen as examples, in order to gain an insight of the changing aspects of migration control throughout the 20th century. It will introduce and explore the conceptual dynamics of this thesis such as migration control mechanisms such as Frontex which are used by the actors in the region.

The Early Beginnings of Migration Control

Pre-WW2 historical trends in immigration policy across Europe vary from state to state. The early migration policies of Europe reflect the distinct differences in state formation (Sassen, 1999). The UK for example had a structured central government much earlier than its European counterparts such as France and Germany. That structured central government allows the production of national level policies which can then be implemented faster because the legislative structures are well established. An example of which is the first national level immigration act the UK enacted which was the Aliens Act 1905 and 1914. The Aliens Act was designed specifically to curb Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe and it is the first example of national level immigration control in the UK. Jewish immigration had created much hostility within the British public they often occupied less desirable areas of London and other major cities (Winder, 2005). "British governments since the 1905 Aliens Act… had two basic

motivating factors which have determined the level of migration which has occurred in the form of the needs of the British economy and the hostility of public opinion" (Panayi, page 308, 2010). The UK was one of the first states in the world to introduce national level migration controls as complex as the Aliens Act. This is for three reasons, firstly, the UK always experienced high levels of immigration in comparison to other states as its position as a dominant colonial power meant that people would readily travel to the UK from its overseas territories. Secondly it was the centre of industrialisation in Europe which encouraged migrants, particularly from Ireland, to fill jobs in the burgeoning industries. Thirdly it was a state of transition for many migrants who were looking to travel from the UK's major ports in order to travel to the Americas. All the contribution factors indicate that migration control was an inevitability for the UK.

During this period of history mainland European states were still operating regionally with little or no central control meaning that migration control could be very different even if it was in the same state. Many of the differences related to the central industry of the region (Sassen, 1999). For example, the north eastern region of Germany had a very large agricultural sector thus required a large number of seasonal migrants to work within that industry. Although the migration control structures were disjointed all over Europe because of a lack of national level controls the number of migrants settled in one geographical area for very long was actually small in comparison to the UK as they preferred to move around Europe picking up short term seasonal occupations, which benefited the local populations as well as the migrants (Sassen, 1995). This early period indicates that early regional control on migration was almost non-existent with controls existing to serve an ad hoc purpose (which suited the migratory patterns at the time). The UK Aliens Act 1905 and 1914 where unusual by comparison. The UK in contrast to its European counterparts were very quick to control migration. Such an early configuration of migration control is attributed to the fact that the UK was receiving migrants that were seemingly less desirable than experiencing the cyclical and seasonal migratory patterns that France and Germany were experiencing that were profitable for industries. It identifies an early beginning for the UK as a key actor in the newly forming external migration control field.

In the late 19th and early 20th century European migration controls centred on the notion of jus sanguinis and jus solis. Jus sanguinis is the principle that citizenship should be granted to those who share a common "blood" with nationally being centred on the principle that it is a biological inheritance rather than a cultural acquisition (Sassen, 1999). Jus solis is the granting of citizenship through the principle of birth and residence. Each principle has its positives and negatives. Jus sanguinis for example is very difficult to control as how far do you allow a bloodline to go back in order to grant citizenship. Germany was an advocate of applying jus sanguinis whereas France and the UK were more inclined to implement the principle of jus solis. The differences between the applications

of the two principles differed on the nation building and sovereignty building practices of each of these states (Sassen, 1999). The reason for each state implementing these principles differently is down to the colonial territories each state occupied. Those subjects born outside of the UK and France still had to be considered as British or French subjects especially those born into upper class families who were living abroad as ambassadors or who had business prospects within the colonies (Czaika and de Haas, 2014). Germany on the other hand did not have the vast colonial territories of the UK and France therefore the application of the jus sanguinis principle was easier and allowed for those born in the borderlands of Germany to claim citizenship after the breakup of the Prussian empire.

As WW2 came to an end European governments were faced with the task of rebuilding their states and with a depleted population, immigration by many states was seen as the most convenient way to access a cheap labour supply (Henry, 1985). However, states also realised that allowing mass migration onto the labour markets would need structuring to ensure the system was not taken advantage of and it had a sufficient bureaucracy to control the inflow and outflow of migrants from across the European region and the world. However, each state took a different route in which to structure the migration control. "The legal frameworks through which the post war migration occurred were varied" (Hansen, 2003, page 25). There are two distinct ways in which migration control was formed at this time. The first was colonial (or neo/quasi colonial) linkages and the second is organised recruitment (Sassen, 1999 and Hansen, 2003). As with the principles of jus sanguinis and just solis, the uptake of which structure was dependent on the size of the empire that you were able to attain migrants from. The two distinct apparatuses reflect that labour migration at this time was highly modulated and happened within systematic settings and through a number of mechanisms. The structures of migration control that we see in modern policies were at this time beginning to take shape, consolidating the habitual behaviours. The norms of controlling external migration through highly structured mechanisms is still reflected in the actions of actors in the field.

The system of using colonial linkages for an immigrant workforce was undertaken by a number of European states including the UK. Colonies, in terms of utilising them for labour, had only been previously used for the slave trade (Czaika and de Haas, 2014). After the abolition of the slave trade, colonialism encouraged more emigration with British nationals exploring the possibility of greater prosperity in the colonies that at home, immigration in fact was relatively small (Holmes, 1988). The idea of exploiting this resource was very attractive to post-war European states. Initially the UK government were apprehensive to open the doors to the empire however they did eventually concede to allowing organised and active recruitment of workers for low skilled manufacturing and agricultural jobs. In the first few months following WW2, The UK adopted similar schemes to that of Germany and

actively recruited from across Europe however this gave way to the UK using its colonial territories to recruit workers. Both these mechanisms will now be discussed in more detail.

Germany's gastarbeiter (guest worker) schemes were a highly centralised set of systems and a number of bilateral agreements were signed with European and North African states (Hansen, 2003 and Heckmann et al, 2009). The states included in the agreement were: Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Morocco, Portugal, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. The German system was the most comprehensive and organised recruitment. Guest worker schemes encouraged temporary migration of workers and upon seeing the successes of other European states the UK's Royal Commission on Population Report in 1949 reported that immigration should be welcomed "without reserve" as long as the immigrants would be able to assimilate to "the host population" (Holmes, 1988 and Rees, 1993). An ageing population, many women returning to domestic roles after the war and the rise of the school leaving age removed a large section of the working population (Hansen, 2003). The UK recruited from prisoner of war camps and from groups of displaced persons whose homes had been destroyed or were not able to go home. "The so called displaced persons constituted an obvious pool of human resource" (Holmes, 1988) and the UK recruited around 80,000 workers from this section of society (Holmes, 1988). This recruitment was not on the same scale as Germany, whose guest worker numbers were in the millions. The number of workers was so high it now means that 10% of the current German population have an immigrant background as a direct result of the guest worker schemes (www.loc.gov). The UK however did subscribe to a number of schemes such as the European Voluntary Worker scheme (EVW) actively recruited workers to go into unskilled manual labour. The majority of these workers came from Poland and other areas of Eastern Europe and the UK wanted to be seen as a state in which migrants could seek a better life. However, "it might be flattering to the national ego to assume… Britain was engaged in a great humanitarian venture… The fundamental influence over official policy was the economic policy in which the government had to operate." (Holmes, 1988, page 212). However, the small streams of labour from Eastern Europe that the UK had benefited from soon became difficult to access as the Iron Curtain descended across the eastern frontiers of Europe and the UK was also not economically recovering as quickly as its European counterparts which effected its popularity with migrants from Europe looking for a prosperous country of destination (Hansen, 2003). It caused the UK to readdress the issue of gaps in labour market and look to other alternatives.

Once the UK made the decision to no longer pursue recruitment from Europe, it copied the colonial mechanisms that France had begun to utilise through its own colonies, an early example of following other behaviours in the field. Migrants from colonial territories became more desirable as they were able to assimilate to the population in the UK quicker. This was because they knew English and were

aware of the cultural customs. The UK government realised that although it lacked the strong economy and the cultural linkages with southern Europe it had over 600 million subjects in the colonies of the Empire (Hansen, 2003). In 1948 the British government enacted the British Nationality Act (1948). The Act stated that:

"Every person who under this Act is a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies or who under any enactment for the time being in force in any country mentioned in subsection (3) of this section is a citizen of that country shall be by virtue of that citizenship have the status of a British subject"

The British Nationality Act, 1948, page 1

The British Nationality Act had a clearly defined policy of what constituted UK national status for members of the public. The act was ratified at the same time as the Commonwealth of Nations (formally the British Commonwealth) was being established and formed part of the restructuring of sovereignty by the UK. The British Nationality Act and the Commonwealth being formed almost in the same period meant that the UK needed to establish who had the right to abode to avoid false claims being made. Once the act became law there was large scale migration of a number of colonial subjects from China, the West Indies, Africa and the Indian sub-continent. The initial migration that the British Nationalities Act attracted concentrated on immigrants from the colonies of the West Indies. However, the act itself was not the only contributing factor to this migration. "It was related in part to the underdevelopment of British territories which had been starved of investment. Such prevailing conditions had resulted in a continual process of emigration by surplus power" (Holmes, 1988) and the immigration occurred from the islands that had the lowest per capita national income. Other conditions also had a contributing factor such as the United States of America imposing the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952 which placed heavy sanctions on the admittance of West Indians to the US. Another factor was the business behind immigration from the West Indies which included direct recruitment from employers such as the London Transport Executive and the British Hotels and Restaurants Association who entered joint business ventures with private steamship companies and airlines in order to transport new recruits across the Atlantic (Winder, 2005). The "business" of migration was also a trend seen in France whose industries sought to recruit directly from the country of origin and would later seek visa documentation from the National Office of Immigration (Hansen, 2003). Less than 10% of the immigrants from the new commonwealth were directly recruited by the UK government (Coleman, 1994). Other immigrants to the UK from the colonies travelled by their own means or were relatives of those who were directly recruited by the UK government. Politically and economically the large scale recruitment of workers from the old empire was a success however, the societal impact was negative. The race riots in Notting Hill and Nottingham in 1958 were evidence of

a changing social environment. The race riots could be viewed in two respects. Firstly, they could be seen as a culmination of many years of tension between national and migrant communities (Winder, 2005). Secondly they could be viewed as a catalyst for the tensions and changes that happened socially and politically following the riots. In hindsight they were an element of both historical tensions and newly developed animosity. It led to changes in the way in which migration control was created by governments, creating some of the first signs of securitization.

The years previous to these riots the European economic and political landscape was changing. The Treaty Establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) had been signed on the 18th April 1951 and continental Europe looked forward to creating "common definitions" (Article 69, Paragraph 2) of the goals that the region wanted to establish. The main idea behind creating this regional actor was to nurture economic growth across Europe as well as creating a bond between states which would hopefully prevent future wars. The establishing states believed this could be achieved by opening the internal border to allow for freer movement of goods and services. The establishing dates were: The Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg and The Netherlands.

In order for this to be able to take place the establishing states understood the importance of creating easier movement of European citizens to facilitate the expansion. Under Article 76 of the treaty the members declared that there should be particular shared privileges and immunities for member states. These privileges included the introduction of a European Laissez-Passer for civil servants and members of the newly established institutions. These tentative moves towards the eventual ethos of freedom of movement indicate the changing attitudes towards internal movement throughout continental Europe. These early stages of control are not regional controls of migration. It is the earliest point of being able to identify a habitual norm. At this point control of migration remained solely in the hands of the member states however this would soon change. However, one can see the early steps towards the external migration control field as the creation of an inside and an outside cultures becomes normalised.

The Treaty of Rome (1957) established the European Economic Community (EEC). The establishment of the EEC took the premise of the ECSC (which was to begin freeing the ability for goods and services to move around the region) and elevated it to a more complex web of interdependencies. The Treaty of Rome (1957) laid the early foundations of what we now know as the EU. The EEC was the first economic community of its kind and it had very strong principles in relation to the movement of people, a philosophy carried from the establishing values of the ECSC. The formation of the EEC was also the formation of the field of external migration control. It believed that "the abolition, as between Member States, of obstacles to freedom of movement for persons, services and capital" (Treaty of

Rome, 1957) was the key to a successful regional economy that would benefit all its members. It declared that member states were "resolved to ensure the economic and social progress of their countries by common action to eliminate the barriers which divide Europe" (page 2, 1957). In relation to migration around the region the treaty established the right to freedom of movement for all EEC citizens under Title III Free Movement of Persons, Services and Capital. The Treaty of Rome was a regional policy on a scale never witnessed before however there were still elements of control of migrants. Movement of citizens could only occur if they had an offer of employment or you prospectively wished to set up a firm or company within the member state that you were travelling to, the freedom of movement did not extend if you simply wanted to change the member state that you lived in. The treaty also outlined the rights of establishment for workers that travelled across the region. The rights secured not only secured abolition of any discrimination against employment in another member state but it also secured the rights of the families and dependents of the workers that travelled.

"Article 51

The council shall, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission, adopt such measures in the field of social security as are necessary to provide freedom of movement for workers; to this end, it shall make arrangements to secure for migrant workers and their dependents:

(a)   aggregation, for the purposes of acquiring and retaining the right to benefit and of calculating the amount of benefit, of all periods taken into account under the laws of the several countries;

(b)   payment of benefits to person's resident in the territories of Member States."

The Treaty of Rome, 1957, page 22

The establishing member states are demonstrating that European migration is of great importance to the prosperity of the region not only for its workers but also for the families and dependents of those moving around. It was also signalling the beginning of the end of a dependency of third country national migration through the guest worker schemes. The establishing member states recognised that internal migration would be easier to control and the migrants would settle quicker as they are European rather than being from outside the region where they may not assimilate to the local population as quickly. The Treaty of Rome is a historical turning point for continental Europe however the UK was not part of establishing the EEC and continued along the path of using immigrants from previous colonial territories. The Treaty of Rome however did afford the UK another status. Part 4 of the treaty outlined the how and which external territories to the newly established region would associate with overseas countries and external territories. The EEC wanted to create "special

relations" with the UK and concluded that "the purpose of association shall be to promote the economic and social development of the countries and territories and to establish close economic relations between them and the Community as a whole" (Treaty of Rome, 1957, page 46). The 'special relationship' did not extend as far as allowing freedom of movement to the UK however from a historical perspective it demonstrates the early relationship that continental Europe and the UK were to create. What it did afford to the UK was some of the economic benefits of being next to a growing global economic power. The UK had managed to become a part of the EU external migration control field, from this point on a more established position could be negotiated, however it would be another 15 years until it would become a substantial actor within the field.

The UK began to feel the strain of commonwealth migration and the changes to the political territories and the social reaction to immigration from the new commonwealth led to the onset of a number of migration controls. The UK government felt compelled to change the law and the next policy (which was an adaption of the Nationality Act) was the Commonwealth Immigrants Act which was passed on the 1st July 1962. This was different from the Nationality Act because it did not automatically grant citizenship to any colonial subject. The Immigrants Act was to begin with uncapped (although sanctions were quickly added) and perspective migrants would have to apply for "vouchers" in order to travel, it was seen as a precautionary measure to ensure there was some control to who was allowed to travel. Unlike the rest of Europe immigrants to the UK were not from mainland Europe (who could culturally integrate quicker) or the poorer fringes of the region but from Ireland and the new commonwealth which is attributed to the unique relationships and arrangements that the UK had with its previous colonies (Coleman, 1994). "This immigration began much earlier than on the continent and was controlled much earlier" (Coleman, 1994) and because immigration has started so much earlier the pressure on housing and employment social tension arose much earlier than it did on the continent.

From the Commonwealth Immigration Act 1962 policy development towards the control of immigration began to slow. However, the public opinion of immigration grew ever more hostile. The hostility from the public (the Notting Hill and Nottingham race riots as discussed earlier) soon began to seep into the rhetoric of the politics of immigration. Enoch Powell's Rivers of Blood speech in 1968 is a perfect depiction of the public opinion towards migration but it also illustrated the shifting political narrative of the time towards migration. The preceding decade before this speech there has been a number of changes to the political environment such as tighter immigration controls from 1962 onwards, the emergences of the National Front in 1967, the tightening of the Commonwealth Immigration Act in 1968 and Powellism whose societal impact has been illustrated above. "Immigration controls are still opposed by the Left but not by the Labour party, even though particular

aspects of the laws are denounced as racially discriminatory" (Coleman, 1994). Although Labour did introduce two Race Relations Acts (1965, 1976), which paved the way for the concept of multiculturalism, political parties agreed that immigration to the UK needed to be curbed. Before an exploration of the political implications context of the speech one must first understand its content. Below are two excerpts from the speech:

"We must be mad, literally mad, as a nation to be permitting the annual inflow of some 50,000 dependants, who are for the most part the material of the future growth of the immigrant-descended population. It is like watching a nation busily engaged in heaping up its own funeral pyre."

 Powell, 1968

Other quotes relay the "damage" that the Race Relations Bill would have on migrant integration;

    "For these dangerous and divisive elements the legislation proposed in the Race Relations Bill is the very pabulum they need to flourish. Here is the means of showing that the immigrant communities can organise to consolidate their members, to agitate and campaign against their fellow citizens, and to overawe and dominate the rest with the legal weapons which the ignorant and the ill-informed have provided. As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding; like the Roman, I seem to see "the River Tiber foaming with much blood."

Powell, 1968

The metaphor he uses depicts violence and rioting if migration was to be left at the same rate. The speech got him removed from his position as shadow Defence Secretary it did not dull the public support of the speech. A poll taken after the speech suggested that 70% of the UK population agreed with the sentiments of the speech (Hansen, 2003). For the UK this was a cross road in migration control. No longer was migration an element of population control but a potential threat that would not only damage the social fabric of UK society but also the economic and political stability of the state. The UK was not the only European state to witness a change to a restrictive approach towards external migration. The norms of the external migration control field were slowly establishing.

At this point states across Europe were opting for internal migration over external migration and these changes in political narrative became reflected in the policy. In France changes to the institutional framework that controlled migration showed a changing attitude to immigration particularly from states such as Algeria. A Directorate of Population and Migration was created in 1966 which sought to halt illegal immigration from North Africa and the southern states of Europe (Wihtol de Wenden, 1994). Germany at this time however was still was recruiting but at a far slower rate than before and there were changes being made to the politics of immigration in Germany. In 1971 (the same year the

UK Immigration Act was created) migrant workers who had been in Germany for longer than five years were given permission to apply for permits which extended their stay by another five years. "These steps considerably diminished the regulatory power of the guest-worker concept and may be interpreted as a political compromise to take into account the gradual adaption of the foreign workers" (Rudolph, 1994, page 121). Although the two streams of migration were different (France and the UK having a colonial stream of immigrants and Germany having a guest worker scheme) the overall political aim was to slow immigration down or as the Conservative party manifesto describes "to reduce and keep new migration to a small inescapable minimum" (Coleman, 1994, page 58). This narrative would become migration control policy in the conception and enactment of the Immigration Act 1971.

The Act was the first comprehensive migration control policy in the UK. Previous to this act migration control had not had the same legislative functions and structures as this act created. The act outlined provisions for regulation and control, the administration for control, provisions for deportation and criminalized illegal immigration. One of the defining features of the Act was the recognition of different kinds of migration to the UK. It outlined that a definition should be made between temporary migration, student migration and permanent migration. By making a distinct definition between the different types of migration the UK government was able to make its controls bespoke to the differing kinds of migration the UK was receiving at the time of the enactment of the policy. The Act also uses the term partial the definition of which is any person who has the right to abode and is subject to immigration control. In 1971 this covered all citizens with the right to abode. Under Section Three of the Act, *General Provisions for Regulation and Control*, it declared that any person who is not patrial does not have the right to abode to unless they have been given special leave to remain. A special leave to remain would be refugee status or you patrial status is agreed once an immigrant has reached the UK after an appeal for example. Any non –patrial immigrant who is found to be living in the UK are considered criminals alongside those that have helped to remain in the UK. It gave the Home Office and the Police the right to arrest suspected illegal entry migrants and those that have overstayed without warrant or investigation as long as they have 'reasonable cause' to suspect an immigrant. These mechanisms and language were relatively unprecedented in the UK and reflected the political and social changes in the UK. It also demonstrates the European pattern of the increasing securitization of migration across the region.

Shortly after the enactment of the Immigration Act 1971 the UK began to aggressively bid for accession to the EEC. The Official Journal of the European Communities Special Edition (27th March 1972) recognised that previous accession applications made by the UK had been unfavourable. The UK was at first apprehensive about joining the community, claiming that it would erode sovereignty. However,

in the early 1960's the UK began to warm to the idea and initial attempts were made by the UK in 1963 and 1967 to start accession. These were halted by the French President Charles de Gaulle, who believed that the UK was not politically willing to join whole heartedly into the community (his apprehension was perhaps justified given the relationship the UK has with the EU). In fact, one of the most prominent factors were the UK's hesitation over the freedom of movement of people. In 1973 the UK (under the Labour government of Edward Heath) joined the EEC. Bourdieu argues that an act is never solitary, everything an actor does places it within a field (Bourdieu, 2010). The UK joining the EEC was a clear message that it wished to appropriate diplomatic capital within the external migration control, therefore manipulating a privileged position. Accession widened the area of the EEC and as more countries joined member states realised that the bigger the area of free movement the more people are likely to move as the opportunities for employment are widened. It also increases the external border and means the edge of the region was now in the Mediterranean. Granting of citizenship in one-member state meant that migrants were free to move all across the Community, this was a consideration for existing member states needed to address. The accession of Greece, Spain and Portugal saw that automatic freedom of movement was not granted to new member states. The fear of mass movement from the economically weaker states to the more prosperous north of the region caused the core members states of France and Germany to rethink if new states should have such freedoms. These limitations are the first signs of reluctance by European states to truly open their borders to free movement of people throughout the region, and the early establishment of the field.

Establishing the Habitus

Over the past few decades there have been significant paradigmatic shifts in the norms of the external migration control field and demonstration of doxical behaviours from key actors such as the UK. The first negotiations of the EEC member states to create a larger more comprehensive regional institution in the mid-1980s were the beginnings of what we know as migration control in the EU now. In comparison to previous legislation from individual member states the idea of free movement was a right rather than a privilege bestowed on those that had colonial or guest worker ties with a member state. "The Single European Act, 1986 which allowed freedom of movement within the EU from 1993, led to a series of Europe-wide policy measures aimed at curbing migration from outside the EU" (Bloch, 2002, page 54). Before this point migration control was an element of politics that had been mostly left to national governments, protecting your own territory came higher on the political agenda then protecting the borders of a state that was the other side of the region. The Maastricht Treaty (1992) was the introduction of the third pillar of Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) which shifted the EEC being a predominantly economic institution to a political institution that also handled the political

affairs of Europe and its member states. This is not to suggest that member states lost all control over their own political affairs it simply added another level of relations between member states and the newly established European Union.

The Treaty of Rome (1957) had laid the foundations for free movement of people however the free movement was often stunted by member states immigration policies (Blade, 2003). What the EEC wanted to achieve, through the Maastricht Treaty, was an absolute abolition of internal borders and expansion of the power of the EU to jointly control borders. The idea received mixed reaction from member states on the basis of the security of the external border. "Much more problematic than regulating transnational migration within the EC/EU was the question of access to this region from the outside." (Blade, 2003, page 289). The UK saw it as an infringement on the sovereign territory and the loss of too much political control. Underlining these main concerns was the loss of security. If migration control was even partially given to an external actor it would mean member state governments would not have full control over the measures taken to ensure clandestine migration was controlled appropriately. Another consideration for member states was the extension of the EU into the eastern region of Europe. At this point in history, migration and refugee displacement was high because the dismantling of the Soviet Union took its toll on internal Eastern European politics (Blade, 2003). However, the Maastricht Treaty was unanimously adopted.

In the Treaty a very specific article was inserted under the heading of *Common Rules and Competition, Taxation and Approximation of Laws*. Unlike previous treaties, Maastricht was building an institution and the introduction of the third pillar of Justice and Home Affairs was the consolidation of the dream of making the EU a political as well as an economic bloc. It also constructed a complex web of policy makers. Instead of the EEC existing as one institution the EU became a trio of institutions namely the Council, Commission and the Parliament as well as the Court of Justice of the European Union. The roles of all the branches of the EU are different. The council is the helm of the EU it points the EU and its member states to general political directions and dispel any issues that cannot be dealt with at level intergovernmental level. The parliament is the institution in which laws are debated and passed it also creates and agrees the EU's annual budget. The parliament also performs checks and balances on the Commission and the Parliament. The Commission is made up of 28 commissioners (and their staff) that deal with varying areas of the EU's remit. It is the institutions which upholds and implements the policies that have been over seen by the Council and the Parliament, it also controls the allocation of the budget and enforces European law as well as being the international "face" of the EU (europ.eu). All these varying facets of the EU have a direct impact upon the way that they create, implement and maintain policies directives. Especially in areas of high importance such as migration. Article K.1 of Title VI of the Maastricht Treaty recognises the external migration control as an area "of common

interest" (1992). In one particular article (Article 100) in the Maastricht Treaty changed the way in which migration was viewed and handled by the EU and individual member states (Blade, 2003 and europa.eu). "Regulations relating to migration issues were consequently dealt with by the first [included within this pillar are the supranational mechanisms that encompassed the ECSC and EURATOM], and third pillars, which is why, for example, the list of countries for which a visa is compulsory could be issued as an EU decree" (Blade, 2003, page 290).

Article 100 c (1992) is one of the most important articles in relation to the control of migration in the region. Paragraph one, two, three and five of the article outline very specific laws for member states to adhere to:

"1. The Council, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, shall determine the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of a visa when crossing the external borders of the Member States.

2. However, in the event of an emergency situation in a third country posing a threat of a sudden inflow of nationals from that country into the Community, the Council, acting by a qualified majority on a recommendation from the Commission, may introduce, for a period not exceeding six months, a visa requirement for nationals from the country in question. The visa requirement established under this paragraph may be extended in accordance with the procedure referred to in paragraph 1.

3. From 1 January l996, the Council shall adopt the decisions referred to in paragraph 1 by a qualified majority. The Council shall, before that date, acting by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, adopt measures relating to a uniform format for visas.

5. This Article shall be without prejudice to the exercise of the responsibilities incumbent upon the Member States with regard to the maintenance of law and order and the safeguarding of internal security."

The Maastricht Treaty, 1992

These four paragraphs are evidence of a shift in the way in which the EU and particular member states deal with migration. In one sense it draws together member states and is the first attempt of unifying migration control and on the other it signifies a distinct lack of unification, these scenarios will now be broken down to understand how this new article changed migration control and how it simultaneously did not effect it.

In previous decades' migration control had been distinctly a member state issue evidence of which can be seen in the varying different programmes that were maintained throughout Europe. "The Treaty of Maastricht opened up the possibility of 'communitizing' areas of national policy, that is, transferring them to EU law" (Blade, 2003, page 290). However, the changes that were being made were having a residual effect on the outer edges of the region. Many states on the periphery knew that the dismantling of the internal border would be good for economic growth however it would mean a strengthening of the external borders. Which is evident in state level political acts such as The Asylum and Immigration Appeal Act 1993.

In 1993 the Asylum and Immigrations Appeal Act consolidated the "new" form of migration as something that needed to be controlled. It was the first act in British history that consolidated rules and regulations over the admittance and settlement of asylum seekers in the UK. "The act demonstrates a trademark of British migration policy, namely that the liberalisation of some measures is often countered with restrictiveness towards other aspects in one and the same act" (Cerna and Wietholtz, 2011, page 199). After the act was enforced the government's preference over the type of migration that they were interested in which was further compounded by the Maastricht Treaty. In France the focus was not of European internal movement but of the importance of domestic politics. "Integration has little to do with the new migratory waves, with asylum seekers and illegals, or with the all-European debates. In the French model, the object is mostly a population that is or will become French" (Wihtol de Wenden, 1994, page 79). Across the border in Germany domestic issues also dominated the politics of migration with tensions between the populations from the GDR (German Democratic Republic) and the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany) (Rudolph, 1994). During this period the UK and the EU transitioned into a new period of negotiation and the political landscape changed. From the outside the migratory politics of the EU had converged and become unified in an ideological sense however the domestic politics of the member states that have been discussed illustrate a much different pattern of divergence at the time of the Maastricht Treaty (1992).

The years following the Maastricht Treaty saw many changes to the controls that managed migration across the region. "Between 1985 and 2000, the European continent experienced a steep increase of resident immigrants, from an estimated 23 million in 1985 to more than 56 million or 7.7% of the total European population in 2000" (Zincone et al, 2011, page 7). Although the change in population was significant the change in the geography of migration was also greatly different. States that had previously seen more emigration than immigration, in particular Spain and Italy, saw a rise in the number of immigrants reaching their shores during this time period. As already discussed the origins of migration prior to 1985 had been colonial, labour or refugee migrations (Bloch 2002, Coleman 1994, Hansen 2003 and Holmes 1988), whereas current migration patterns are more blurred. Alongside

these changes there has been a shift in the way the EU, states and governments are making efforts to influence migration and settlement patterns. Pre-nation state, the regulation of admission was down to local authorities and cities, the building of nation states greatly influences the way migration is controlled, however it was the introduction of the welfare state systems that changed the way states controlled migration. It led to questions of who should be allowed access to welfare and how can "outsiders" slot into the nation based developed patterns of welfare. "Within Europe, the making of migration policies developed unevenly in terms of both time and place. Depending on national trajectories and experiences, such policies have also been articulated in various ways and at different points along the way" (Zincone et al, 2011, page 11). States such as the UK, the Netherlands and France had to redefine colonial relations and migrants coming from colonial states. They also had to create very specific instruments to control these flows.

The Maastricht took at small step to the 'communitizing' of migration policies (Blade, 2003) whereas the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) expanded the concept. "It transferred to EC/EU law the subjects of the Schengen agreements that had previously been treated outside the EC/EU, and the entire area of visas, asylum and immigration issues was transferred from intergovernmental cooperation (third pillar) to the jurisdiction of the EC (first pillar)" (Blade, 2003). The key word that Blade uses is cooperation, before Amsterdam the ideological position of migration control across Europe was that of cooperation not political obligation to adhere to EU law however the treaty changed this position. The deeper integration of a semi common immigration and asylum policy did not gain public of political support in the UK, they instead adopted their own initiatives. After Labour's landslide election in 1997 the actively sought to revitalise the job market with highly skilled migrants. Between 1997-2008 highly skilled migration alongside student migration accounted for 52% of migration during this period (Cerna and Wietholtz, 2011). "Over the last decades, the UK has undergone a profound shift from a 'zero immigration country' to one that adheres to the paradigm of 'managed migration' (Cerna and Wietholtz, 2011, page 199). The "management" really boils down to an extremely restrictive policy towards asylum seekers and illegal immigrants however relatively open to highly skilled migration and student migration. The level of openness to this kind of migration can be greatly argued, however it is dependent on the politician and how the media perceives any new migration policy.

The UK may not have agreed to the Schengen however they did converge their policy with the external migration. Although each state is still responsible for the protection of its sovereign borders some control has now been assigned to other institutions under the Amsterdam Treaty. Quasi autonomous institutions that have been given the power to securitize migration such as Frontex (whose official name is European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union) who purpose was to create an intelligence driven

institution to combat clandestine migration from the East and South of the EU (Neal, 2009). It created an intergovernmental instrument to frame policies around a regional directive of migration control and securitization. The European Council on Justice and Home Affairs have taken dramatic steps in the past 15 years to reinforce region wide cooperation on internal and external migration, asylum and security. Frontex was the culmination of a number of strategies such as the External Border Practitioners Common Unit which was a group that was constituted of the members of Strategic Committee on Immigration, Frontiers and Asylum (SCIFA) and the executive officers of national border control services. Firstly, the Council created a number of pilot projects across the EU which it called ad-hoc centres. They created six centres:

- Risk Analysis Centre (Helsinki, Finland)

- Centre for Land Borders (Berlin, Germany)

- Air Borders Centre (Rome, Italy)

- Western Sea Borders Centre (Madrid, Spain)

- Ad-hoc Training Centre for Training (Traiskirchen, Austria)

- Centre of Excellence (Dover, United Kingdom)

- Eastern Sea Borders Centre (Piraeus, Greece)

Information taken from: http://frontex.europa.eu/about-frontex/origin

From the establishment of these centres the council decided upon a wider reaching institution which eventually became Frontex by the Council Regulation (EC) 2007/2004. "Frontex promotes, coordinates and develops European border management in line with the EU fundamental rights charter applying the concept of Integrated Border Management." (Frontex, accessed 13th January 2014). Integrated Border Management (IBM) is a structure in which member states are urged to coordinate and cooperate border management through institutions such as Frontex. IBM promotes larger (more financially stable) states to support less developed states with funding and personal to develop their border protection (europa.eu). IBM is especially important in the Mediterranean as many of the states that process the largest proportion of the migratory volume from North Africa are lesser developed than their Northern European counterparts. Such funding is illustrated in the budget of Frontex. The 2013 budget is €93, 950 000 million, €8 million more than was first estimated for last year. Contributions from Schengen associated countries was €5, 730 000 million and from the UK a total of €1 million (frontex.europa.eu). More practically Frontex controls the joint effort of EU states to protect the EU's southern border, by land, sea and air. Although Frontex is not a policy maker its existence

and its actions are evidence of the EU's trend of securitization of migration. This is illustrated through their publication of quarterly and yearly reports on their missions and current projects through the Euro-Med region.

There are other institutions which act out the orders of policy making institutions. Frontex is an example of a regional migration control institution whereas the UKVI is the nation state level migration control institution in the UK. The UKVI controls the UK borders, consulates and visa processing centres as well as internal visa processing and clandestine detention. The UKVI is far more about the prevention on illegal immigration, the coordination of labour migration and the protection of refugees. It has largely been criticised for the way in which it runs its detention centres with groups such as Amnesty International and the UNHCR claiming that they are more like prisons than places of shelter for refugees. All of these actors play a role in the external migration control field as they correspond with the norms of the field. Their interaction away from the central actors of the field (member states) are what strengthens the field. They 'sign read', which means their actions confirms one habitus' affinity with another. In simpler terms if their behaviour deviates from other fields norms they are protected by the behaviours of those around them. Mirroring the habitual behaviour of those with greater power within the field means lesser actors can gain capital.

Conclusions

This chapter has demonstrated the complexities of modern day migration control the UK and the EU. These complexities have arisen from the historical roles that each state has had in the recruitment and movement of labour across the region. The two types of early migratory streams (recruitment and colonial) have eventually led to the same conclusion of region wide control and although this control happened at a different pace it has eventually led to a regional consensus that external migration is contentious therefore is subject to strict control. The evidence from this chapter illustrates that although policy convergence is a historical trend it is often by coincidence rather than an immediate want to secure a region wide policy. One historical trend and a trend that is still evident within current migration politics is the growing control and the use of many types of policies and institutions used to gain that control. A trend that has been accelerated by the dismantling of the EU's internal borders (Bade and Brown, 2003). The UK is a key factor in the politics of migration control in the region as it chooses to adhere to particular controls for example Frontex but not others, for example Schengen. From this chapter onwards will be the analysis of policy documentations that have to the control of migration. Documentation such as the ones that have been mentioned here will be analysed in relation to how and why the UK uses particular EU migration control mechanisms but not

others. The establishment of the field of external migration control was necessary in order to understand the behaviours and actions of the actors in the field.

Securitization:

The Habitus of the External Migration

Control Field

The concept of securitization has developed in International Relations over the past 30 years. It is a means of trying to understand the processes states and institutions take in which to protect their sovereignty. Securitization can manifest itself in many ways through dialogue between the media and populations to diplomacy and through government and institutional policy. This chapter will be analysing the latter. The growth of securitization in government policy has been expediential over the past 15 years. There have been a number of catalysts which have caused such an rise in securitization by governments and the subsequent influence on regional actors and institutions. Events such as the 9/11 bombings of the Twin Towers in New York and further terrorist acts in Europe over the last 10 years have all had an effect on the securitizing practices of states and intergovernmental institutions. The threats posed by terrorism, the changing face of conflict as well as an increase in the number of non-state actors facilitating illegal movement of migrants, are just some of the reasons for the growth in securitization. Human migration has had a profound effect on the securitizing practices of states and regional/international institutions. This is nowhere more truly felt than the European Union (EU) and its member states. External migration into the EU has seen unprecedented growth since the late 1980's. The type of migration has also changed. As well as economic migrants seeking better employment within the EU there has also been a rise in trafficking and smuggling of human beings as well as seeing large numbers of refugees and asylum seekers as neighbouring states are politically unstable (Costello and Hancox, 2014).

These challenges at the borders of the EU as well as the global trend of anti-Islamic feeling by populations living in western states has caused a dramatic shift in the structures in which external migration to the EU is now managed, especially by member states such as the UK. As discussed in the previous chapter securitization is an action that has been evident in the policies created by the UK and the EU since the earliest conceptions of freedom of movement for European citizens and gained momentum as economic migrants travelled from previously colonial territories, culminating in the discussions by academics such as Ole Weaver (1993) in the securitizing practices of states and institutions in relation to the rise of global migration. What will be discussed in this chapter is the

processes of securitization since the Maastricht Treaty up until the most recent changes in UK policy, the 2014 Immigration Act. This will be done in context to the theoretical framework of this research. It will be argued that securitization has developed as a doxical behaviour of the UK through following the norms of the field that are set by the EU as the head of the external migration control field. There are a number of distinct periods of securitization since the Maastricht Treaty. The first is the Maastricht Treaty itself, the Amsterdam Treaty and the two major changes in British policy, the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 and the Immigration Act 2014. These policies are markers which signify changes not only in the securitizing practice in the institution or state in which they were enacted by also major changes within the external migration control field. As well as these significant policy changes the securitizing practices of externalising EU borders and an analysis of the quasi military/policing institution, Frontex will be addressed. There will also be a section in which the doxical behaviour of securitization will be analysed in terms of the UK's position within the external migration control field and how the securitization processes can lead changes in the relationships between the actors in the field.

The Growth of Securitization

Huysmans (1995) discussed the cultural changes in western society in the early 1990s and its effect on the securitizing behaviours of states. Huysmans argued that a feeling of insecurity within society that is fed by images of 'dangerous' and 'violent' cities placed next to images of migrants and refugees raised the threat from being a threat to the individual to a threat to society and the collective identity (1995). Around this period the rising fear from society was mirrored by a rise in the discussions had by politicians around the subject of migration. The rhetoric spanned across all levels of governance. NATO gave lectures on international (in)security in which migration was a regular topic. It was also at this time that the EU were structuring the Schengen agreement and Dublin Convention.

The Dublin Convention is of particular interest when assessing the growth of securitization norms within the field of external migration control (Drewry et al, 2004). The narrative of the convention placed 'issues' of refugees and asylum seekers in the same category of drugs and terrorism. Agreements such as the Dublin Convention reveal the norm building practices of actors within the field. Article 3 Paragraph 5 outlines the rights of states to process request third country processing: "Any Member State shall retain the right, pursuant to its national laws, to send an applicant for asylum to a third State, in compliance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention, as amended by the New York Protocol" (Dublin Convention, 1997, page 3). The coding structure used to analyse the data recognised this as a cooperative securitizing practice firstly because it is a document issued by the head of the field but secondly it allows member states to externalise their controls to third countries.

It is why Frontex as an immigration control structure also has the remit of attempting to control the smuggling of drugs and weapons into the EU alongside the human movement over external borders as they use third countries to alleviate the pressures on member states a fact that was supported by Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003. The perpetuation of external migration to the EU as a security issues in the early 1990s was reinforced by academics studying it. Huysmans (2000)m places Weaver and Buzan (1993) as some of the key academics that placed migration on the security agenda. He argues that academics from strategic and security studies viewing migration as a security issues and discussing it within the literature legitimises it as a security issue.

Buzan (1991) in his key text *People, States and Fear* argues "In the case of security, this discussion is about the pursuit of freedom from threat. When this discussion is in the context of the international system, security is about the abilities of states and societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity." (pages 18-19). External migration into the EU has perceived negative impacts on the ability for states to achieve what Buzan is arguing. Independent identity and functional integrity brings into question concepts of sovereignty and territory, two things in which a state actor is most interested in securing. Both concepts have an impact upon an individual and collective identities. If these are threatened it is enough of a catalyst for people to interpret threats as security problems. From this point Buzan claims that the security 'story' is made up of three parts:

1.   The threat.

2.   The object which is threatened.

3.   The maintenance of this objects identity.

It follows an almost structural understanding of the security issue; at the centre is a threatened identity and at the peripheral exists the threat. The security story follows the Hobbesian model; the creation of an object for abstract fear then locating it in other agents. The two agents are then interlocked which gives them the drive to securitize against the perceived threat. For this reason, it is best to keep the migrant, whether they be an economic migrant, refugee or trafficking victim under a single collective identity. Like the Dublin Convention, by placing them all in one identity rather than assessing individual traits such as gender, age, religion or wealth it is easier to securitize against the threat. By maintaining the threat as a singular agent it is therefore easier to create policy to attempt to eradicate the threat. Article 1 Paragraph 1 is testament to this: "'Alien' means: any person other than a national of a Member State" (1997, page 3). Instead of differentiating between Asylum Seekers and Refugees the EU simply use the term 'alien'. From a Constructivist perspective: "Security is interpreted as a social construct, which means that it is something produced by social practices in a

particular spatial and temporal context" (Huysmans, 1995, page 66). For Europe in the early 1990s there was a distinct feeling of change which was acknowledged by state and regional actors. The changes to the international migration control field would and have had a distinct impact upon the external migration control field.

Huysmans (2000), Weaver and Buzan (1993) have approached the securitization of migration into Europe from a position where there is no overarching control over decisions made in terms of policies in attempts to control external migration into the EU. This control is not categorised by a literal power or governance by an external actor. This power comes from head of the field which is a predetermined role. In terms of the external migration field the head of the field is the EU. As discussed in previous chapters a field is "a social arena within which struggles or manoeuvres take place over specific resources or stakes" (Jenkins, 2002, page 84). The stakes that are at threat are the stability of an influential political and economic bloc. The different forms of capital such as economic, social, cultural and symbolic (Jenkins, 2005). By analysing the securitization of external migration into the EU using field theory as a tool it can explain some of the differences and similarities in the way migration into the EU has been managed since 1992. Regional differences within social groups can blur national interests, as can social conditions and previous contact with migrant groups (Leitner, 1997). "Dominant racial and national ideologies, defining who belongs and who does not belong to a national community, also influence who is admitted" (Leitner, 1997, page 263). Principles of citizenship and policy are influenced by national ideologies which can be subverted for economic and political gain. The gain which is able to made in the field of external migration control is a more stable regional field and a more stable state.

The Perception of Threat

Threat perception is an important element in the securitization processes of the UK and the EU. "Threat does not operate in a void; it only functions by threatening something" (Huysmans, 1995, page 55).

 "An approach which is central to the process of policy formation is that which distinguishes migrants according to the basic cause and intention of movement" (Collinson, 1994, page 2).

The negotiation of the Maastricht Treaty (1992) was central to the securitizing practices of the external migration control field. It was a period when members of the field felt doubly threatened. On one side they had the potential erosion of their own political/territorial sovereignty and on the other they had a growing concern of the rise in migration from third countries. "There is much at stake in the present Europe because there is a certain openness to fundamental changes in the organisation of that

Europe" (Huysmans, 1995, page 63). The changing landscape for a member state such as the UK was doubly difficult to handle because of the refusal to join the agreement. Prior to taking such action the UK, and other member states had been able to deal with their own migration flows. Particularly states which had created post-colonial migration flows or dedicated structures such as the guest worker policy in Germany. "Historically European nation-sates have successfully used their powers to control flows of international migrants and deter a great deal of unwanted immigration (Leitner, 1997, page 260). The early 1990s was categorized by many different kinds of migration. One of the largest groups being economic migrants as globalisation opened an even wider international job market but also a large number of refugees from civil unrest in Eastern Europe. It was unprecedented and European states were feeling the strain more than most because of the high amount of previous colonial migration. The negotiation for Maastricht began before 1992 when the Thatcher era in the UK was beginning to come to an end. The political baton was picked up by the new Prime Minister John Major. Major was generally enthusiastic about the widening of the responsibilities of the new EU: "A centralist Europe is most likely to develop if Britain has no influence in the Community, if it is side-lined, and if we do stand aside and let others run Europe while Britain scowls in frustration on the fringes" (Major, 1992). However, his Home Secretary Kenneth Baker was less than enthusiastic: "If these matters were to pass into European competence in the way that the Liberal Democrats want, there would be an inevitable weakening of our controls and our frontier controls, which I am not prepared to accept" (House of Commons Debate, 1991). This changing landscape had a profound effect on the relationships within the field of external migration control. Bourdieu argues that a field is a "structured system of social positions" and are defined by the stakes that are at stake (Jenkins, 2002, pages 84-85). This can easily be adjusted to view the field as a structured system of political positions. The ease of redefining these political positions is based on how willing members of the field are to changing or creating their own habitus within the field. Habitus is defined by Bourdieu as an "acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted" (Bourdieu, 1977, page 95). In context to the field of external migration control the single most objective scheme is security. The sovereignty of member states is paramount even within such a complex political field. Securitization at time was one of the key areas in which all member states agreed.

"In the struggle for the nation state, a highly securitized migration could well be a strategy for reaffirming the identity of the nation state" (Huysmans, 1995, page 63). Post 9/11 the integrity of the national identity of many western states was under a perceived threat. The War on Terror that followed had a direct impact on the policy making of those within the field of external migration control in Europe, especially in the UK where immigration and terrorism policy are so often interlinked.

Unlike the argument from Huysmans (1995) that claims that securitization starts with a societal perception of a threat. In the 2000s the threat was manifested by politicians which started a new era of external migration control management.

The 2014 Immigration Bill represents a more recent struggle for the UK and its relationships within the field of external migration control. The bill was introduced to parliament as one of the biggest changes to external migration control since the 1971 Immigration Act. Prime Minister David Cameron said of the act "Hardworking people expect and deserve an immigration system that puts Britain first. Over the past 4 years we have clamped down on abuses, making sure the right people are coming here for the right reasons" (gov.co.uk, 2014). Prior to the introduction of the act the then Conservative – Liberal Democrat coalition had been trialling a number of schemes in order to curb illegal immigration to the UK this was in relation to the regional struggles at this point of refugees arriving due to the civil uprisings across the Middle East and North Africa. This rise in numbers had sparked societal and political unease and was one of the leading issues during the 2011 election campaign. During the House of Commons reading for the 2014 Immigration Bill the expansion of powers for UK immigration officers was widely discussed. The majority of MPs were behind the idea that immigration officers at ports and processing centres external to the EU, including centres that were in North Africa. What makes the 2014 Immigration Bill unique is the securitization of the service industry. Up until this point securitization was an action that happened externally, in the EU and outside in third countries. During the Ping Pong session in the House of Commons on the 7th May 2014. The then Home Secretary Theresa May, was quick to blame the previous Labour leadership however as predictable as her thrashing of the previous government was the language which was then used was more akin to a terrorism bill than to a policy that was created to control external migration. A Guardian headline captured the feeling of the moment: "Immigration bill: Theresa May defends plans to create 'hostile environment'" (2013). The hostile environment was supported by the rebranding of the UKVI (formerly the UKBA) and the infamous "go home" van initiative instigated at this time. The 2014 Immigration Bill was exclusively for the control of third country nationals, meaning migrants that do not have the right to freedom of movement. On page 6 of the document it was evident the UK government was securitizing against potential threats rather than having a determined plan or specific threat. Terms used were:

• "very dangerous"

• "seek to threaten"

• "legitimate security issue"

- "a real and current threat"

This language is repetitively used throughout the discussion. When you look at the recent terrorist acts passed by the UK government the language is almost interchangeable. An example of which is the omission of Section 38 of the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act 2006 by the Counter Terrorism Act 2008. Section 38 outlined specific structures in which information could be gained about migrant, refugees and asylum seekers by other authorities. The Counter Terrorism Act removed these structures allowing for information to be gained without the bureaucracy. The removal of the Section 38 is a clear securitizing act by the UK government. It demonstrates that the UK believe foreign nationals are more likely commit terrorist acts therefore information regarding them should be readily available to authorities.

This is also a key point when you take the rhetoric of securitization and see how the government simply discussing the act of securitizing to actually witnessing as a palpable structure which has been created and maintained. The public image of the 2014 Immigration Bill was to ensure migrants entered the UK fairly however the mandate of the bill between politicians was one of securitization. The language as used above does not even attempt to hide the sentiment of the government. This rhetoric is continued when you compare the Final Immigration Act to the Immigration Bill (as amended in public committee).

- Page 2 insertion of the word enforcement.

- Page 5 insertion "Deprivation if conduct seriously prejudicial to vital interests of the UK".

- Page 6 insertion of the word detention.

The argument continues through the Immigration Bill – Factsheet: Article 8 (clause 14) where Immigration Minister Mark Harper believes the courts can be over generous with the rulings in regards to Article 8 (European Convention of Human Rights; Right to Private and Family Life). "It is for parliament to decide what the public interest requires" (2014, page 1). All throughout the progression of the Bill to enactment the government repeatedly exposed the fear of external migration. Much of the former Home Secretary Theresa May discussions during parliamentary Ping Pong within the House of Commons centred on the governments right to revoke citizenship to those suspected of terrorist acts. May was extremely eager to allow the revocation of citizenship even if the individual was in a third country. Rendering an individual stateless when in a third country goes against the UN Human Rights Charter, however, what must be recognised is the rhetoric that surrounds this is of securitization. This is supported by the UK Borders Act 2007 in which it is stated that foreign national offenders with sentences of 12 months or more are subject to automatic deportation. This allows for

the securitization of external migration to not only be an action that happens at the borders of the UK or in visa processing centres but an act that could happen within the legal system of the UK. The Immigration Report 2014, introduced to parliament in October 2013 outlined that the drive behind the policy was that English language and economic wellbeing are the only factors that the UKVI will consider when assessing a claim for leave to remain. The 2014 Immigration Act also attempted to address the securitization of migration from within the UK. One of the policies main aims were to make access to public and private services much more difficult for migrants without correct documentation. It outlined that landlords of private rented accommodation would have to "check" the immigration status of prospective tenants and banks would also have to ask for documentation pertaining to the status of individuals. This faction of securitization by the UK government illustrates them not only adhering to the doxa of securitization but evolving it too, expanding the field of migration control to cover areas that have previously been unaffected by immigration policy in the UK. Expanding previously exclusive social structures and transforming them into political and security structures is evidence of the UK going above and beyond the requirements of the field. However, does this then effect the UK's position within the external migration control field?

This exposure however was not unique to just the UK the whole EU external migration control field migration was continually being securitized. Externalisation and promotion of a security driven mandate was evidence at all levels of EU governance. This is evidence of the UK cooperating with the EU (a concept which is explored in a subsequent chapter) but it is also evidence of the UK following the established EU doxa as part of the external migration control field. An example of which is the *Agreement between the Government of the UK of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium, Concerning Immigration Controls on Rail Traffic between Belgium and the United Kingdom using the Channel Fixed Link* (2014). The act outlines the plans for a "secured safety zone" which are clearly designated areas of train stations which are not publicly accessibly in which border controls are integrated into commercial ticket control. A "control zone" which would be part of the "secured safety zone" and would be an area which UK immigration officers can perform checks on Belgian territory.

Frontex was designed as a quasi-policing/military structure in which Schengen and some non-Schengen states come together to try and stem the flow of movement by humans, weapons, drugs and illegal goods at the outer borders of the EU. "Frontex promotes, coordinates and develops European border management in line with the EU fundamental rights charter applying the concept of Integrated Border Management" (Frontex, 2016). Frontex specialises in particular actions such as CIRAM: "To analyse all the data, Frontex has developed its own risk analysis model, called CIRAM - the common integrated risk analysis model. CIRAM provides Frontex with a foundation for coordinating

joint operations at the external borders. Gaining knowledge on cross-border criminality is essential for the establishment of an appropriate reaction. Therefore, CIRAM enables assessment of the relative risks posed by different threats. It was developed in close consultation with member states, and is applicable both at EU and national level" (Frontex, 2016). External migration control structures such as CIRAM represent the core norms and values of the field and as such are a manifestation of those norms. It takes securitization from a passive, at times an unconscious action and reverts it into an active behaviour. It is important that member states are seen to actively participate in these structures and mechanisms of external migration control. If they are participating it means that they are adhering to the norms set by the head of the field. Not participating would be an indication of a deviation from the field. What is most interesting from the analysis of CIRAM is that it states that it is a regional and a national structure in which to control migration. For those in the field, especially the UK, who can find participation in the field impacting negatively on sovereignty, the EU is buffering the participation in the structure offering member states different ways in which to access and show how they are norm building alongside member states.

Frontex: Doxical Enforcement

The most dominant actor of the external migration control field, the EU, and other members of the field coming together under the umbrella of securitization is an action that is not solely undertaken by models and structures that have been created by the head of the field. They also come from actors within the field that create mechanisms for all members to participate in. Frontex began as manifestation of fears over the extension of the EUs border during the accession of the A8 bloc. However, Frontex, although heavily reliant upon EU funding, has become an actor in its own right. It has become a focus point in which member states can exercise securitizing practices. Active participation in the mechanisms that Frontex have created is evidence of member states adhering to the doxical norms of the field. UK participation in Joint Operations (JOs) with Frontex is an explicit form of securitization. As seen throughout the other sections of this chapter, UK securitization is often passive and hidden in the subtext of policy and actions made by the UK Visas and Immigration office (UKVI). However, UK action within Frontex represents an overt participation in the norm building practices within the field, a want to follow the structures set by the head of the field, the EU. JOs take place when there is a recognised common need to prevent or remedy external migration. The UK has participated in 66 JOs and has also led a number of operations. One of the most recent operations was a JRO (Joint Return Operation) which the UK led. JRO to Nigeria was actioned on the 28.01.2014 and the purpose was to return Nigerian nationals that had overstayed. Eight other member states were included in the operation which were: Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Iceland, The Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden.

All the states which participated returned at least 1 Nigerian national and the total number returned was 62. The UK taking charge of a complex removal operation, on charted flights which poses other risks, is proving the head of the field that they are willing to take risks to fulfil the role of a securitizing actor, to truly participate in the field. Return operations at a national level have received some negative reactions from members of the public. One such incident was when a migrant that had decided upon voluntary removal died on a flight as he was deported from the UK. The Guardian published the headline: "Deportee asked for help on flight before dying, witness says" (2010). Incidents such as these prove the lengths that members of the external migration control field are willing to go to secure territories. The removal of migrants is a last resort as members of the field strive to securitize migration before it reaches the removal stages.

The JOs completed by member states are not only for the returns of illegal over stayers but also preventing external migration. The externalisation of securitization is a trend that the external migration control field have followed since the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) (Garlick, 2006). As we have seen in the European Neighbourhood Project and the bilateral partnerships created with North African states the externalisation of control is a high priority for the field (Andrijasevic, 2010, Lavenex, 2006 and Lavenex and Schimmelfennig, 2009). An air border operation that took place in 2013 demonstrates this. Joint Operation Focal Point 2013 Air: Frontex Evaluation Report (2014) was conceived as "Frontex identified different threats posed by irregular migration to the integrity of the European external air borders prior to the start of the joint operation… based on the agreed vulnerabilities identified bilaterally with Member States, Frontex nominated some Temporary European Focal Point airports while Third Country Coordination Point Airports were chosen upon their relevance in terms of operational cooperation" (2014, page 3). There are a number of points to highlight in this information. Firstly, the language that is used highlights the importance of securitization for the field. Words such as threats and vulnerabilities demonstrate the effect external migration has on member states. Stability of the field is essential for it to maintain its control over external migration. The externalisation of border security is evidence of this as it shows that if field security and stability is to be maintained it must stop external migration before it even reaches the territory.

During this time ongoing civil and political disputes in North Africa were having a knock on effect to Frontex operations. The combination of threat and growing numbers in the movement of people over the southern European border build up into securitization operations. 32 airports were included in the operation all over Europe and it acted within the existing framework of the EU's Integrated Border Management. This multilevel approach to the securitization of external migration exposes the lengths which members of the field are willing to go under the flag of securitization. The total cost of the

operation was €1,159,884 (approximately £881,732) a large amount of money for states who were coming out a recession and continuing the rhetoric of austerity domestically. The operation was seen as a success with the objectives being mostly achieved. For example, the ability to identify possible risks and threats, enhance border security and support to establish permanent structures that can remain after the operation finished. The narrative of the document highlights how broadly successful the operation was however the numbers of migration that were caught attempting to enter the EU were relatively small. What is most interesting about the operation was the importance placed on the gaining insight in the movement of specific groups of migrants, in particular the irregular movement of Syrian and Iraqi nationals. "The operation shed light on the activities of those involved in seeking to facilitate the irregular entry of migrants into the EU. It provided a deeper understanding of the routing and methodologies used by these criminal groups." (2014, page 5). This is also reflected in the quarterly and annual reports produced by Frontex. In the Q1 report of 2010 the discussion of the facilitation of Vietnamese nationals attempting to enter the UK, it is the same rhetoric.

The Annual Risk Analysis (ARA) 2010 also discusses the externalisation of controls to neighbouring states: "The bilateral collaboration agreements with third countries of departure on the Centre Mediterranean route (Italy with Libya) and the Western African route (which Spain signed with Senegal and Mauritania) had an impact on reducing departures of illegal migrants from Africa" (ARA, 2010, page 12). The scale of the externalisation operations in terms of geographical area, monies spent and political negotiation is testament to the importance that the external migration control field place on securitization, and more specifically the externalisation of that securitization. There was a significant shift in the language used in the Frontex reports from Q4 2011 onwards. There are a number of key external factors that can be attributed to the increasing amount of securitization. Firstly, the civil and political changes in North Africa had a direct impact on the number of migrants crossing the southern border. "In the Central Mediterranean area, the large number of detections in 2011, which suddenly increased following the Arab Spring in Tunisia and Libya" (ARA, 2013, page 5). Secondly, the type of migrant impacted upon the reaction by member states. Many who were crossing were not economic migrants but refugees, Italian authorities reported that there was also an increase in unaccompanied minors in the Central Mediterranean route, they accounted for 30% of those crossing. The overall reaction by the external migration control field was that of securitization. At the time Frontex had a strong definition of what it perceived as a threat, how it would consider itself vulnerable: "a 'threat' is a force or pressure acting upon the external borders that is characterised by both its magnitude and likelihood; 'vulnerability' is defined as the capacity of a system to mitigate the threat and 'impact' is determined as the potential consequences of the threat" (ARA, 2013, page 11). You would be forgiven for thinking that Frontex are attempting to deal with a military force. However,

this language is very reflective of that which was used during the Amsterdam negotiations 15 years prior to the Arab Spring. By using the first and sixth code the securitization language was identified because of the reactionary behaviours of the actors. The same narrative was repeated when Schengen was conceptualised and again when the A8 accession moved the external border further east. Unlike cooperation and manipulation which have slowly increased over the course of the fields history, securitization is the deepest and most established doxical behaviour of the EU.

The doxical norm of securitization is supported by all faction's field explicitly discussing the threats. One could argue that being so explicit is simply a way of legitimising the spending of just over 1 million euros however, there is a deeper connection to the doxical behaviours of the external migration control field. If we look back at the securitization practices during the Maastricht Treaty (1992) and more particularly the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) what we can correlate in the continuation of the norm. The doxical behaviour of securitization was a founding pillar of the external migration control field.

In Piet Eeckhout's book titled *External Relations of the European Union: Legal and Constitutional Foundations* (2005) he discusses the processes which led to the gaining of powers around the control of external migration leading up to the Treaty of Amsterdam. The original EEC (European Economic Community) had few provisions which expressly referred to external action other than those outlined in commercial policy. However, the articles of the original treaty establishing the EEC do have subtle hints towards the potential future of external migration control. Article 229 (now Article 302 EC) outlines that the commission should maintain it relationships with actors such as the United Nations, GATT and other international organisations that it has relationships with. The next Article (now Article 303 EC) also reiterates that cooperation with the Council of Europe should also be maintained. Neither of the articles give a definitive and/or substantive argument or statement towards gaining or utilising any power to act under international law. However, Article 238 (now Article 310 EC) states "the community may conclude with one or more states or international organisations agreements establishing an association involving reciprocal rights and obligations, common actions and special procedures". This article unlike those previously discussed give a little more specificity towards the possibility of external action. All these articles create an idea and feeling of implied powers. This is important when looking at the relationship of the external migration control field.

As discussed previously capital is the key factor within the relations between actors in any given field. Implied powers allow actors to feel more important than they actually are in terms of their position with the field. As Adler-Nissen and Jenkins (2002) have discussed capital is what shapes an actor's behaviour. The potential to gain more capital leads to that actor becoming more powerful and influential within that field. The implied association that Article 310 EC suggest was never clearly

defined. It highlights a structure but not how such an association would ever be utilised. At the time of negotiation, it was thought the article would be rarely, if ever, used. However, it was used immediately to conclude association agreements with Turkey and Greece. This is not the same as full membership the EC at that time. There were a number of agreements which were concluded on the basis of Article 310 EC which never implied possible membership. The Article was actually mostly used during the dismantling of member state colonies as a way of establishing political and economic links. The potential of these associations are perhaps reflected in the numerous external relations that the EU has with neighbouring states through schemes such as the European Neighbourhood Policy. There was a specific part of the agreement in which external migration was discussed. Title IV discussed a complex programme of legislative and administrative action which were to be implemented within a 5-year period after the Amsterdam treaty. This Title is less interesting to analyse as it presupposes controls and says little about the underlying habitual behaviours of actors like the EU. It follows the rhetoric established by years of internal negotiation to establish the norms of the internal migration control field. What Article 310 EC offers is an insight into the possibilities of external migration control actually becoming external to the territory of the EU.

From Doxa to Habitus: The Externalisation of Borders

Externalisation of borders is something which needs to be discussed with looking at the securitizing actions of the UK. The externalisation of borders is a practice that is very difficult to trace in terms of being able confirm whether an actor has explicitly placed its border in another country. It also goes against the norms of international relations to believe that one state can place its sovereign border outside of its own territory without causing conflict with another state. However, if one takes the concept of implied power as discussed above the idea that a state could place its border in another country. Externalisation of borders happens when a state has exhausted or has failed to curb immigration. The UK in the early 2000s was suffering with a steep rise in immigration and a number of failed schemes in which to stem the flow. The Home Office's Immigration and Nationality Directorate, Work Permits UK, Immigration Service all failed to lower the net migration figure in the UK. It was at this time that the UK looked elsewhere in terms of immigration control. Frontex was slowly establishing itself as a key factor in the control of migration from the south however the UK was securitizing external migration control through its own domestic policies. The document simply titled Immigration Control (September, 2006) published by the UK government was a response to the Home Affairs Committee Session 2005-2006. The document highlights a number of key areas of interest/issues in the control of external migration at the time. One of the most revealing areas of interest was the support of the development of the Biometric Visa Programme. It reveals the UK interest in the international management of external migration. It witnessed the advent of the "hub

and spoke" model of control. These hubs would be placed globally in areas of particularly high migration. From a regional hub smaller immigration offices would deal with the processes of visas pre-entry into the UK. "Exporting the border effectively cuts down on the numbers of people travelling undocumented to the UK" (2006, page 18). The thinking behind the policy was that if prospective migrants can apply for entry into the UK before entering sovereign territory it would be possible to cut down on the number of illegal over stayers because they should have been assessed previous to gaining entry. The externalisation processes have also been witnessed in the progressive use of external migration control structures such as Frontex. Frontex is the closest the EU has managed to get to produce a uniform structure to manage external migration. The initial mandate of Frontex was as a policing mechanism and as a way in which member states with less developed structures could come together with states with more effect tools and economic power. These seemingly benign structures began to take a different form with the advent of the use of Rapid Intervention teams. "The basic idea behind rapid interventions are to bring assistance to a Member State that is under urgent and exceptional pressure. The pressure relates especially to large numbers of third-country nationals trying to enter the territory of a Member State illegally" (Frontex, 2016). The changes in the mandate of Frontex, therefore potentially changing the structures of the field.

The UK government document *Faster, Fairer, Firmer – a modern approach to Immigration and Asylum* (July, 1998) revealed the extent to which the UK follows the securitizing norms of the EU. Effective returns are seen as vastly important for all members of the external migration control field. It is the tool in which if they have failed to stop a migrant reaching the EU they can remove them effectively and efficiently. The document acknowledged the "experience among EU member states" as a norm to work towards. This statement was in the context to returns. The Dublin Convention was signed in 1990, however did not come to force until 1997. It created a system of returns for EU member states of failed asylum seekers. It was then extended by the Eurodac convention which created an EU wide data system for the retrieval and storage of the finger prints of asylum seekers. What it effectively does it create a database in which the removal of failed asylum seekers is eased by retaining biometric data. If a previously failed asylum seeker attempts to gain entry back into the EU, even if they present with false documents, authorities can assess a claim almost immediately. It has meant that an asylum seeker or refugee cannot enter one state be denied entry and then enter another European state and try and claim asylum again. Once a claim is placed that individual will only be given leave to remain in that one state and will not gain access to the right of freedom of movement until they pursue indefinite leave to remain through the granting of a visa. What is most compelling about the rights of refugees and asylum seekers in the EU is the active rhetoric of securitization as much as any other migrant group. Refugees and Asylum Seekers are protected by international law and must be given

leave to remain in a host country if it is assessed that returning that individual would cause them harm or worse death, rights which are protected not only by the Dublin Convention but also by under the UN Declaration of Human Rights, 1951. In the early 2000s the media narrative of "illegal" asylum seekers were popular especially in the tabloids of the UK. A judicial decision caused this kind of headline illegal and did little to change the social attitudes towards asylum seekers and refugees. This is because the more vulnerable groups of migrants, like refugees, asylum seekers, smuggling and trafficking victims are placed within the same narrative instead of being treated differently. Terms become almost interchangeable and this has been a growing trend not only in the media but within the policies of the UK and the EU.

In 2005 the then Labour government, fronted by Tony Blair released a government document titled *Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain; Five-year strategy for asylum and immigration* (2005). The years leading up to the release of this document were positive in terms of the relationship that the UK were having with the EU. They were actively taking part in EU initiatives like Frontex. The years leading up to 2005 had seen rises in net migration in the UK and the government were feeling pressure from political opponents and the electorate to reduce the figures. This document covered all areas of migration control, including internal migration from the EU. What featured heavily was the narrative that the UK government would regain control of illegal over stayers and have stricter controls on those abusing the system. Tony Blair stated:

"There will be a new drive to prevent illegal entry, to crack down on illegal working and a tough policy of removals for those who should not be here. There will be on-the-spot fines for employers who collude with illegal immigration. We will fingerprint visitors who need visas, and those planning longer stays, before they arrive. We will, where necessary, use our powers to demand financial bonds from migrants in specific categories where there has been evidence of abuse, to guarantee their return home. And over time, we will move towards the point where it becomes the norm that those who fail can be detained, as asylum intake falls and removals become easier as we negotiate ever more effective returns agreements."

Tony Blair, *Controlling our borders*, 2005, page 8

This paragraph from Blair's introduction highlights a number of key points of interest. It demonstrates the layers of securitization that the UK has created over the years since the Maastricht Treaty. The one of the most dominate is the discussion on stopping abuse on the migration system before prospective migrants arrive in the UK. The other dominant narrative is the discussion of effective returns. This is evidence of securitization, as a doxic norm for the external migration control field and can be found at all level of governance in the UK. This is true of the EU at this time which was

attempting a number of external migration control measures externally and internally within the region. This mirroring shows that the actions of the head of the field are reflected in the actions of actors within the field that are not as influential. These narratives were continued in the section discussing the securing of the borders. Charles Clarke, who at this time was Secretary of State reiterated the need for further securitization at the borders of the UK.

"Over the next five years we will transform our immigration control. Using new technology, we will develop an integrated control before people enter the UK, at our borders and while they are in the country. We will fingerprint everyone when they apply for a visa. These fingerprints and other personal travel information will be checked against our own watch lists of those who present an immigration or security threat."

Charles Clarke, *Controlling our Borders*, 2005, page 10

Clarke takes the evidence of securitizing practices further by using more aggressive language. He uses the terms immigration and security threat in the same breath which is a difference from the tone of language that Blair used.

Section 4 of Controlling our Borders is centred on the

"d) Action in Europe

55. The EU has established a new border agency to co-ordinate control at the EU's external border. This will substantially improve Europe's capacity to deal with vulnerable crossing points and in particular to work to strengthen the EU's new border to the East."

Exploring which actors are securitizing against external migration in the EU is important. As Bourdieu explains the doxical behaviour of actors in the field are what adds stability to the field. Stability is of great important to individual nation-states but when securitization is a stabiliser for multiple actors and when the perceived threat is so severe then the field, and the protection of it, takes precedence. As previously discussed in another chapter the EU and other member states in the field have securitized against migration since the treaty which formed the field, the Treaty of Rome, 1957. Stability comes when all actors within the field are actively taking part in the processes of securitizing alongside the maintenance of structures which have been built previously. This is one of the reasons why securitization quickly turned from a habitual behaviour to a doxical one. "Habitus only exists in, through and because of the practices of actors and their interaction with each other and the rest of their environment" (Jenkins, 2002, page 75). It becomes an integral part of their behaviour not just a manifest of it. It comes from an actor experiencing it and teaching it with practices being imprinted into the behaviour of actors. Every actor, therefore, becomes a producer and reproducer of the

behaviour. Of course the nature of the field being hierarchical the producers of the behaviours are more likely to come from those who dominate the field. "The existence of a field presupposes and, in its functioning creates a belief on the part of the participants in the legitimacy and value of the capital which is at stake in the field" (Jenkins, 2002, page 85). Interest in the field is historically legitimated but it is these same processes which produce the field itself. A property of the field is the "game" the inherent struggle that actors have within it to reproduce and adhere to the rules of the game. Securitization has become so established in the "game" that actors are willing to go above and beyond to evidence that they are willing to adhere to the established norms of the field. This is evident through the various hoops that prospective member states have to jump through in terms of external migration control when trying to achieve accession to the EU.

The biggest issues for new states is the convincing the EU and its member states that enough has been done to protect the external borders. It is why the possibility of Turkish accession has been met with such hostility because it would mean the EU 's border ends no longer in the geographical area of Europe but with Middle Eastern states (europe.eu). Member states fear this would lead to a spike it migration from the region as Turkey is viewed as having insufficient borders to deal with the flow. It is almost a return to the Cold War era where Europe felt the need to have a sufficient buffer between itself and the former USSR. This is one of the reasons why the creation and maintenance of the ENP and work through the European Union External Action Service (EEAS) has been so crucial to the EU. Both of these initiatives and structures were born out of the long abandoned Barcelona Process. The Barcelona Process was initiated in 1995 as a means of creating stronger bilateral and multilateral relationships between 15 EU member states and 12 Mediterranean states. There were three broad structures of the process:

- "Political and Security Dialogue, aimed at creating a common area of peace and stability underpinned by sustainable development, rule of law, democracy and human rights.
- Economic and Financial Partnership, including the gradual establishment of a free-trade area aimed at promoting shared economic opportunity through sustainable and balanced socio-economic development
- Social, Cultural and Human Partnership, aimed at promoting understanding and intercultural dialogue between cultures, religions and people, and facilitating exchanges between civil society and ordinary citizens, particularly women and young people."

Europa.eu, 2016

The Barcelona Process was the moment in which externalisation of border control, as an extension of the norm of securitization began. However, the Barcelona process soon became too cumbersome, it

lacked any direction and a breakdown of relations between those involved occurred however as previously mentioned the Barcelona Process may have been vastly scaled back but elements of the negotiations were redistributed to other structures. "With the introduction of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) in 2004, the Barcelona Process essentially became the multilateral forum of dialogue and cooperation between the EU and its Mediterranean partners while complementary bilateral relations are managed mainly under the ENP and through Association Agreements signed with each partner country." (Europa.eu, 2016). This is evidence of the EU seeking avenues of securitization even when one fails. Securing partnerships with neighbouring states is seen as a vital action as it gives the EU implicit powers to place upon external actors. It places these actors within the sphere of influence imparted by the external migration control field. By placing them within the field the EU can practice a small amount of influence over them. It creates a "donkey – carrot" scenario whereby the EU can secure its external borders by giving aid and economic reimbursements and in return member states have securer borders. Securitization through externalisation happens at all levels of governance as can be witnessed in the relationships that some member states had with North African states. The UK did not only pursue the hub and spoke model in North Africa but also sought to fund a fence along the southern borders of Libya, a venture that drew interest from a number of member states. The former Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi negotiations for the returned of third country nationals under the Friendship Agreement 2009 illustrates that members of the field are willing to potentially sacrifice their position in the field to securitize against migration.

Securitization in the field of external migration control has come at a number of key junctures since the negotiations and subsequent enactment of the Maastricht Treaty (1992). Running up to this point migration from third countries was rising. However, the type of migrant was also changing. Previously migrants had tended travel to the UK and the EU as economic migrants. The rise of refugees and asylum seekers to the Europe was dramatically rising. The UK alone saw a sharp increase in the early 1990's:

Numbers of Refugee and Asylum Claimants in the UK

- 1979 – 1,563

- 1985 – 5,444

- 1990 – 22,000 (including dependents the figure rises to just over 30,000)

- 1991 – 44,745

Coleman, 1994

The steep rise from 1990 to 1991 can be accounted for by civil conflict in Eastern Europe and the majority of claims made in 1991 were rejected by the UK. However, it is significant in the narrative of securitization in the field of the EU external migration control field. It is a watershed moment because the negotiations for Schengen went hand in hand with the beginnings of negotiations to create a coherent external migration control policy. The narrative continued into the negotiations for the Treaty of Amsterdam where the early conception of Frontex was created. Whilst the regional behaviours of securitization developed, the domestic policy reflected the actions of the dominant actors in the field. This is evidenced in the number of policies that the UK created between 1997 up to 2014. Previous to this period there had only been very small changes to the policies since the 1973 Immigration Act. There were also a number of external influences on the securitizing practices of the external migration control field such as the 9/11 terrorist bombings in New York and the following conflict caused a surge of refugee and asylum claims from those fleeing the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is worth acknowledging that the increase in securitization by the EU and member states, in particular against migrant movement from the Middle East was coupled with a growing cultural shift in attitudes toward Muslims in Europe. A growing political right wing movement, widely publicised in the media has stigmatized much of the migratory movements from the Middle East and North Africa. The financial crash of 2008 also impacted somewhat on the social and political attitudes of external migration. The perceived drag on welfare resources such as housing and healthcare that migrants cause has meant some strong changes to the policy landscape by many states within the EU, including the UK, who have adopted stricter policies in terms of entry, restricting access to services once in the destination country and placing more bureaucracy on migrants and/or refugees and asylum seekers once they gain entry.

Conclusions

Securitization in the external migration field has steadily increased over the past 14 years. As discussed in this chapter the rise in securitizing practices are because of a number of external political and social factors however there has been steady securitization regardless of events. As seen in the previous chapter the processes of securitization began before Maastricht in 1992 however the addition of the third pillar of control gave member states two elements to securitize against: the encroaching powers of the EU and regional doxical behaviours becoming cemented and the rise in net migration across the region all attributed to the rise in securitization. The analysis of UK government and EU policies have revealed the extent to which securitization has now creeped into every level of regional and national governance. Securitization as a political agenda is a very divisive tool for politicians at all levels of governance to use in order to win elections or favour. However as has been discussed the securitizations processes the UK and the EU have been through represent much more than a simple

want to be elected or remain in power.   The evidence of growing securitization practices is found in the changes in language used in association with external migration. In the early 1990s migration was normally for economic purposes or fleeing conflict as an asylum seeker or refugee. In following chapters, the evidence will be given on how the doxical behaviour of securitization has then split between manipulative behaviours and cooperative behaviours between the UK and the EU in context to external migration control.

Manipulation:

How deviant is the UK?

In the previous chapter the control of migrants travelling from North Africa and the securitization of these structures and practices was discussed. Securitization is a precursor for manipulation as an actor is more willing to do what it can to protect itself from perceived threats, even if this means the manipulation of established norms and structures in a field. This chapter will concentrate on the manipulative behaviours demonstrated by actors in the field of external migration control. Manipulation is not a behaviour or concept often discussed in International Relations. It had a brief period of popularity when academics such as de Rivera (1968), Janis (1982) and Riker (1986) sought to understand the link between psychology and international actor's behaviour. Little has progressed from this period, however, it is an important behaviour as it signifies a distinctly negative and potentially destructive element of a relationship between actors.

Manipulation can only occur between two actors who have a complex relationship and interdependence. If you abstract manipulation as a behaviour seen in individual human beings and attribute it to behaviours witnessed by international actors the potential for extreme changes to the international system is high. As Bourdieu discusses the field is a set of actors whose behaviours determines their position within it (Bourdieu, 1984). If manipulative behaviour has the possibility of allowing an actor to self-determine their position it is a viable outcome that any actor would try to change a situation, policy or negotiation to their advantage. In context to external migration control field, advantages that could be gained are changes to free movement, use of regional structures for national gain, reduction in the admittance of refugees, for example. Gaining advantage in these areas could also mean that states are able to reposition themselves closer to the most powerful actor of the field. Therefore, manipulative behaviour can have national and international advantages. The chapter will be discussing some of the theories that have developed out of the concept of negative behaviours of international actors and the effect this has on foreign policy. It will then demonstrate how manipulation can be recognised in the domestic polices of the UK, as well as bilateral and multilateral agreements it holds with Member States and the EU in the field of external migration control. The chapter will also analyse the relationship between the UK and Frontex by discussing the reports and operations that the UK participates in. The section below will clarify the use of the term manipulation and how this research recognises the difference between influence and manipulation.

One consideration to be made when investigating whether an actor is demonstrating manipulative behaviour is understanding what is manipulative and what is influential behaviour. At an international level certain states pertain to have influence over others. This is potentially for a number of reasons such as historical influence, economic dominance or military authority over other states, it can also be a combination of these. Influence is defined as affecting the mind or actions of another party (James, 2013). The definition of manipulation is not that distant from influence, it is the action of managing or directing a person in a skilful manner in a subtle, devious or unjust way (James, 2013). Therefore, what is the defining feature that allows a researcher interested in manipulation to separate the two actions? James argues that influence is broadly considered a positive action. Manipulation on the other hand is seen as negative and subversive. The actions taken will also benefit the actor alone unlike influence where the action has the potential to improve the position for all those involved (James, 2013). Within a field of control, the two actions will have a profound effect on an actor's position within it. If we take James' definitions of influence it produces a positive outcome, then an actor will benefit from potentially favourable treatment by the actor that controls the field. If manipulation is negative this could undesirably affect the position of an actor in that field. Bourdieu explains that the structures of a field are designed to facilities the interaction within the field, therefore, why would an actor risk a loss of respect and at worst a position within the field but deviating from the norms (Bourdieu, 1991)?

Doxical Behaviour

It could be argued that the UK has been manipulating its position within the EU since its earliest conception so how has it managed to retain a position within the field of migration control? It has done this by positioning itself it very particular ways at key junctures when decisions have had to be made concerning external migration control. Rather than pushing wholly against norms and expectations the EU has created it often finds a half-way house in which it will please regional and domestic critics. Influence also denotes a particular level of hierarchy within the field. To have influence is to have power (indirectly or directly) over another actor. In terms of external migration control the UK has a large amount of influence because it is extremely vocal when it perceives migration as a threat to the socio economic fabric of the UK. These ideas will now be explored further in the chapter in context to legislation and agreements.

Constructivism understands that a state or actors' identity is variable and dependent on the on historical, cultural, political and social context it is in (Hopf, 1998). Hopf goes on to discuss that to be a EU member is to have multiple identities which are historically constructed (1998). Constructivism understands these identities are supported by social practices. In relation to field theory these identities are what positions actors within the field. The social practices which aid them become the

actions in which their position within the field is maintained. What Hopf discusses further is that elements of an actor's identity that are "missing" have been purposefully omitted (1998). In context to this research the UK does not openly adhere to all the identities that other member states display in terms of external migration. The most obvious example being that it is not part of the Schengen area. The Schengen area was the development of the free movement ideal constructed in the Treaty of Rome (1957). Other member states were open (albeit with a small amount of negotiation) to enhancing this concept because it had become a socially constructed norm for EU citizens to be able to pass freely over each other's borders. It would be flippant to suggest the UK's absence from this well publicised identity marker is manipulative. As Hopf argues: "choices are rigorously constrained by the webs of understanding of the practices, identities, and interests of other actors that prevail in particular historical contexts." (1998, page 177). Nowhere is this truer than in the identities and interests of the EU member states especially in context to the history of external migration. As discussed in the historical context chapter there has been a shared history of migration control between the actors in the field. The manipulative behaviour that the UK demonstrates is a learnt norm and/or behaviour. From the treaty which outlined the UK's accession it is demonstrated that the UK had little interest in following the interests of the newly emerging union to the letter. In the Official Journal of the European Communities Special Edition, 27th March 1972 the UK was cited as recognising the difficulties of expansion versus the European interest of freedom of movement. The document also discusses the EEC (European Economic Community) has a different definition of what constitutes a national. The differentiation is heavily influenced by the colonial histories of the UK and other member states which is discussed at length in the first chapter. As discussed in the methodology chapter, the evidence of particular behaviours is to be found in supporting documents rather than the final policy document. This small difference in definition sets a precedent for behaviour in the field of migration control and although it does not affect external migration control directly the example has been set. Bourdieu understands norms in behaviour are historically constructed especially when they impact upon the structure of the field (1992). Structure building and the impact that has on relationships is evident in the EU/UK bond, historically and in modern negotiations.

Manipulation as a distinct action within policy making practices has not been widely explored by researchers or academics within International Relations. What has been assessed are the impact of negative decisions made in relation to foreign policy making practices. Irving Janis built on the work of de Rivera (1968) and created the concept of Groupthink. Janis refers to Groupthink as "a deterioration of mental efficiency, reality testing, and moral judgement that refers from in-group pressures" (1982, page 9). He explains that even those who are in a position of great power or responsibility face the same social pressures as anyone would. However, the decisions made at the

international level go far beyond that of a domestic social setting. What is missing from Janis' analysis is the consideration of the domestic policy making process has on the international relations of a state. This is nowhere more evident than when you examine the processes and structures of external migration control in the EU. As migration control is a power that is partially centralised in Brussels and partially controlled by member states you naturally have the impact of domestic policy on the regional policy making process. The negotiations of treaties and agreements first have to be ratified and agreed on in member states. No more so than with migration policy as it is so widely contested by a wide range of actors. External migration policy creation for EU member states is essentially a domestic act. However, it needs to coordinate with EU level treaties and policies and adhere to the doxa of the external migration control field. For example, any member state could not create a policy which would contravene EU conventions. This is a barrier to domestic policy making which the UK has come up against before. David Cameron has attempted to curb EU migrant's rights to welfare which is against the convention of free movement. David Cameron has cited this is one of the reasons he has consistently missed the current government targets for lowering net migration in the UK. What this chapter will answer is if the UK government is manipulating regional level structures to manage the number of external migrations that come to the UK. Hanrieder (1967) scanned over the concept of states as international manipulators in an article where he looked at the relationships between domestic and foreign policy making. He claims that: "Foreign policy - the more or less coordinated strategy with which institutionally designated decision makers seek to manipulate the international environment-generally meets with tenacious resistance, if not insuperable obstacles" (1967). What Hanrieder is describing in the act of a nation state using the creation of foreign policy to improve their situation. He claims that international actors have prescribed roles which they act out or what could be conceived as political essentialism.

These prescribed roles are influenced by the sociocultural predispositions that guide the creation of foreign policy. If one applies this to the UK/EU structure it demonstrates that the UK plays the role of the interrogator within the field of external migration control. Therefore, the concept that the UK has the potential to manipulate structures and seek action for its own good rather than the good of the field is not beyond the realms of possibility. Janis argues that there are particular "defects" that groups develop especially when negotiating policy where there are lots of differing interests at stake. One of these defects is selective bias which is witnessed when actors consider external resources. These external resources are varied and can include experts (academic or professional), the media and charities to name a few, the number of external resources will be dependent on the issue that is being negotiated at that time. For example, there will be more external resources to consider if the whole field have an interest in the outcome rather than an issue where only the minority if those in the field

have a stake in the final outcome. External migration to the EU is an issue where many differing actors have a stake in the outcome of common policy. However even domestic policy can have a knock on effect in the creation of external migration control structure and it is these domestic policy interests which are contributing the manipulative behaviour of the UK in the field of external migration control.

The Case of Frontex

Migration is a national and internationally perceived threat therefore an actor may find it easier to manipulate the field, particularly if one or more other actors in the field can see a benefit in their action. UK manipulation of the field is evident in its use of Frontex. External immigration to the EU is seen as a threat which effects every member state individually as well as the integrity of the region itself (Geddes, 2000). Each member state strives for the best policy to curb immigration from its external borders. Coherent regional policy has been an ongoing struggle for EU member states since the conception of open internal borders (O'Dowd et al, 2003). The academic trend was to view Europe as a fortress (Geddes 2000, 2003 and 2008) however a fortress implies that the internal politics is stable and a fortress can be constructed because actors within it all agree its function. A fortress also implies a level of impenetrability but the increasing numbers of external migrants and refugees crossing the EU's borders gives an account of a different situation. The closest structure to a region wide control of external movement in to the EU is Frontex. As has already been discussed within the Securitization chapter, Frontex's primary function is to act as a quasi-military policing force that attempts to curb immigration from the south and the east of the EU (Houtum and Pijipers, 2006). As well as a deterrent they also aid member states in processing migrants, detention of clandestine migrants and the creation of specialised task forces. The task forces are created on a relatively ad hoc basis in reaction to high numbers of particular nationalities or international sporting events that attract third country nationals. Frontex defines their function as:

"While regular border control is the exclusive responsibility of the Member States, Frontex's role focuses on coordination of deployment of additional experts and technical equipment to those border areas which find themselves under significant pressure. Frontex also builds the capacity of the member states in various areas related to border control, including training and sharing of best practices."

Frontex, 2016

As described the task forces are created as a means of alleviating pressure from areas deemed to be at risk of high immigration, either as "illegal" immigration, people smuggling or trafficking. For example, they create task forces to help with higher levels of immigration during international sporting

events. The original premise of Frontex was as a regional protectorate for those who signed the Schengen agreement (Frontex, 2016). However, from the very earliest conception of Frontex, the UK has been a participant at many levels of this external migration control structure. The original structure of Frontex was a number of "hubs" each having their own specialisms. Like the description of the task forces, it illustrates one of the key functions of Frontex is a practice sharing process. The UK had one of these hubs in Dover. The justification for the Dover unit was the specialism of border checking that officials possessed in the processing centres in the port: "Centre of Excellence for border checks, located in Dover, United Kingdom (the aim of the Centre was to strengthen the EU external border by using modern search technology to combat illegal and, in particular, concealed immigration)" (Frontex, 2009). From this point onwards the UK participated in a number of differing task forces and practices that Frontex developed (which will be discussed at length further into the chapter). One might argue that the UK is simply participating because of its obligations to the EU. However, the participation of the UK goes beyond that of simple obligation. The data Frontex produces is varied, offering insights into their operations alongside detailed information pertaining to the movement across the EU's southern border. The data analysed from Frontex has been coded alongside policy data from the UK to understand the domestic political impact on involvement in Frontex. What this section argues is, is the UK is using Frontex to pursue national/domestic gains rather than simply fulfilling the obligations of its position within the field of external migration control. The first suggestion of this manipulation is the financial contributions given to Frontex by the UK government since its creation in the mid 2000's. There are two reasons why this is important. Firstly, investment in a mechanism that is not primarily designed to protect the borders of the state where the investment is coming from signals that the state in question perceives a threat from that external border. Secondly continued support even when your domestic government is beginning negotiations around a possible exit of the regional power which controls the structure are even more extraordinary. Having a stake in Frontex has evidently been important to the UK government.

This is apparent in the discussions had by the House of Lords European Union Committee in the 9th Report of Session 2007 – 2008. The recommendation of the House of Lords committee was: "For the present the United Kingdom has to accept that, not being a full Schengen State, it cannot play a full role in Frontex. Subject to that legal limitation, the Government should ensure that the United Kingdom participates effectively in the development and operation of Frontex." (House of Lords, 2008, page 54). In a published communication between a House of Commons Minister (who is not named in the document) and the European Scrutiny Committee the wishes of the House of Lords were reiterated "The benefits of participation include not only the deterrence and apprehension of illegal immigrants but also the acquisition of data and intelligence and the development of stronger links

with other countries' immigration authorities" (Committee Communicate, 2008). Using the code *UK engagement with EU migration policy making for the Euro-Med area* is a means of identifying UK commitment to use EU mechanisms to improve their *own* data and intelligence databases.

This is the key to the UK manipulative behaviour, rather than joining Frontex to aid the entire external migration control field their actions are to benefit themselves. This could be dismissed as a single event; however, these sentiments were repeated two years later in a UK communique with the European Commission, who was seeking to extend the powers of Frontex; "It [the UK] is invited to attend the meetings of FRONTEX Management Board and takes an active part in them as a non-voting observer. In 2010, the Government will contribute €570,000 to the cost of joint operations and other activities in which the UK participates" (2010). This excerpt from the document highlights the key to the UK's position within the field. The UK participates in the norms of the field, such as securitization through the expansion of Frontex, but also negotiate a position in which they can still have a voice within the management board. This opinion is supported by the reports published by Frontex.

The quarterly and annual reports published by Frontex are an insight into the interests of the EU as well as member states who contribute to its function. They have been released by Frontex to showcase their activities and offer qualitative and quantitative data as a means of justifying its function as an external migration control mechanism (Frontex, 2010). The evidence found within these documents demonstrates the use of Frontex by the UK to stem migration to the UK. Many of its activities within these mechanisms could be classed as manipulative cooperation as they illustrate the UK's want to control its own borders and in order to achieve this it needs to cooperate with other member states. The reports are written by the Frontex Risk Analysis Unit (RAU) to "provide a regular overview of irregular migration at the EU external borders based on the illegal migration data provided by Member States border-control authorities in the context of the Frontex Risk Analysis Network (FRAN)" (Frontex Q1 Report, 2010, page 6). The two elements of Frontex that need to be clarified here are the differences and similarities of RAU and FRAN. Frontex gives the definition of RAU as being:

"Risk analysis is the starting point for all Frontex activities, from joint operations through training to research studies. In order to identify short- medium- and long-term trends, a wealth of data needs to be gathered and analysed. For this, Frontex monitors the global security environment, especially those political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental factors which could affect border security. The agency collates data from Member States, EU bodies as well as from public media and other sources within and beyond Europe's borders. Collated data is analysed with the aim to create as clear a picture as possible of the situation at the EU's external borders."

Frontex, 2016

The FRAN is made up of multiple areas of regional border control and national border control both policing and military personnel. The reports also cover a large range of data from the external border controls it includes, detections of illegal border crossing, detections of facilitators, detection of illegal stay, refusals of entry, asylum applications and forged documents. Within these differing areas of the report it also publishes findings on smuggling and trafficking of humans alongside the movement of illegal goods such as alcohol, cigarettes and arms over the EU external border. In the first available report there were indications that the UK was using Frontex in order to gain improve their illegal immigration figures by using a mechanism that was not even designed for their use.

Within the section of Detection of Facilitators in the Q1 FRAN report 2010 there is evidence of the UK not even having to use its own provisions in order to curb illegal immigration. The section of the report states that: "France highlighted the elimination of several facilitation networks specialised in the smuggling of Vietnamese nationals, the final destination being the UK" (Frontex Q1 Report, 2010, page 14). The action taken to eliminate these networks was after a number of member states reported that Vietnamese nationals were being linked to cannabis production in a number of member states. To say the entire operation was just for the benefit of the UK would be naïve.

The operation to curb the illegal movement of Vietnamese migrants to the UK is not the only evidence of Frontex's operations benefiting the UK directly in terms of a reduction of the numbers of illegal immigrants that could have potentially reached the borders of the UK. The annual report in 2010 mentions operations to curb Afghan nationals travelling through the Western Balkans to whose destination was "mostly towards the UK" (Frontex Annual Report, 2010, page 20). As well as the UK being a consideration in terms of border control hundreds of miles away from its own national borders. The data from the Frontex report demonstrates that UK interest in Frontex and the protection of external borders is extremely important for the UK, especially when migrants crossing those borders are destined for the UK.

Bilateral Doxical Behaviour

Le Touquet Treaty (2011) or less well known *as the Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the French Republic concerning the Carrying of Service Weapons by the Officers of the UK Border Agency on French Territory in Application of the Treaty concerning the Implementation of the Frontier Controls at the Sea Ports of Both Countries on the Channel and North Sea* is an agreement that the UK and France signed in Paris on the 24th May 2011 in conjunction with a Statutory Instrument (SI) (Number 2818, 2003). Before Le Touquet is discussed in terms of its impact it makes more sense to go back to 2003 and discuss SI 2818. SI 2818 was created to form part of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002. The outline of

SI 2818 is: "This Order gives effect to the Treaty between the United Kingdom and France providing for the exercise of immigration control by the authorities of each State in the sea ports of the other State" (2003). The ports that are effected in the agreement is Dover in the UK and Calais, Boulogne and Dunkirk in France. All these ports have a high number of human movement in and out of them for example in 2014 10.8 million people crossed between Calais and Dover (Sea Passenger Final Statistics, 2014). The SI details that these ports will have control zones in which each authority. The laws in which UK border agents act under in UK ports are the same in the French control zones that are outlined in this SI, which are as follows:

"Application of criminal law to a Control Zone in France

12.— (1) An act or omission which constitutes an offence under one of the following

provisions of the 1971 Act shall also be an offence if it takes place in a Control Zone in France—

(a) section 24A (1)(a) and (3)(a) (deception);

(b) section 25 (assisting unlawful immigration to member state), but as if subsections (4)

and (5) were omitted;

(d) section 25A (helping asylum seeker to enter United Kingdom);

(e) section 25B (assisting entry to United Kingdom in breach of deportation or exclusion

order) (b);

(f) section 26 (general offences in connection with administration of Act); and

(g) section 27(c) (offences by persons connected with ships or aircraft or with ports) but

as if the words "or aircraft" and "or disembarkation" were omitted."

(Statutory Instrument 2818, 2003)

The instrument gives UK officers the powers to make arrests before the migrant has crossed to the UK therefore allowing officers to process beyond the UK sovereign territory. Similar to the controlled zones at Eurotunnel and Eurostar terminals (which are discussed later) they offer member states the opportunity to curb illegal movement into their territory before they have even arrived. SI 2818 impacted different policies; Immigration Act 1971, The Terrorism Act 2000, The Immigration (Leave to Enter and Remain) Order 2000 and The Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2000. For a SI to cause alteration to so many other UK immigration policies reveals its significance. The Home Secretary at the time said "We are effectively moving our borders across the Channel." (Daily Mail,

2003). The Le Touquet Treaty was a reaffirmation of the agreement as well as giving British and French officers the powers to carry a "service weapon" which is a telescopic baton that has been issued by the relevant authorities. (The discussion of this further securitization of the border was analysed at length in the Securitization chapter).

The agreement and the treaty highlight the lengths in which the UK will go to protect its border, even if it needs to move it across the English Channel but it also shows its ability to manipulate other actors to create the best possible outcome. Its use of Frontex is evidence of regional structures being manipulated the agreement with French authorities shows the UK are willing to manipulate structures at a bilateral level. How are the UK authorities having a presence in France manipulative? The evidence shown so far is not enough to be sure that the UK uses its relationship with France to create an asymmetric capital gain. Alongside bilateral agreements with France the UK donates economic aid to the areas around the French seaports. An article in The Independent details the large amounts of money the UK is willing to give too other to "deal with" illegal immigration. "David Cameron is to agree to give an extra €20 million (£15.4 million) to France for policing and dispersing migrants attempting to reach the UK from Calais, a minister has said. In a radio interview before a Franco-British summit at Amiens in the Somme, the French Europe minister, Harlem Desir, said the extra funding came on top of previous British spending of €60 million (£47 million)." (The Independent, 2016). Physical presence by UK immigration officers as well as large donation to curb migration from France to the UK shows a willingness to keep bilateral relationships stronger in order to curb the number of migrants coming to the UK. One could argue that if the UK followed the norms of the field it would not have to manipulate the field of external migration control by picking and choosing which actors to make agreements with. Bourdieu labels this behaviour as actors attempting to "change the rules of the game": "There can be a struggle to change the rules of the game… which consists in cheating on the game and establishing a tacit regularity that will become to rule" (Bourdieu, 2014, page 94). The UK are seeking to change the norms of the external migration control field by making smaller changes in the bilateral relations it has with member states. It is seeking to normalise manipulative behaviour at a lower level of governance to seek changes in other places in the field. This is not a behaviour that is limited to Member State interaction, it can also be found between NGOs and Member states like the UK and Frontex.

The documents produced by Frontex dramatically changed in 2011. It was during this time that the political dynamics of North Africa changed. Previous to this the numbers of migrants crossing the southern Mediterranean border had been in relative decline but the civil uprisings predominantly in the North African states of Egypt, Libya and Tunisia, causing a steady growth in the number of migrants travelling as economic migrants or seeking refuge. The Frontex reports changed from a vehicle of

communication to advertise current and upcoming operations to a comprehensive analysis. There was a significant emphasis placed on external security factors and the language within the documents became much more security orientated. The executive summary in the 2011 Q1 report demonstrated this by opening the report stating: "For the first time since data collection began in 2008, detections of illegal borders crossings have exceeded those for the preceding quarter" (Frontex, Q1 2011, page 5). During this period the UK took part in multiple Joint Operations (JOs) with Frontex, such as JO EPN Hermes Extension and JO Hera. The participation of the UK in such Joint Operations is evidence of its use of external migration control structures for its own purpose instead of pursuing the needs of the whole field. Rather than perusing the "immanent rules of the game" which would be to actively engage with the all of the operations. Manipulating the structure in order to benefit from the positives it can offer means "playing against these rules" (Bourdieu, 2014). This action illustrates how the UK gains from accessing regional structures whilst giving very little back, much like the small asymmetrical gains made through Le Touquet Treaty (2011).

Control the movement of migrants from North Africa was not the only way in which the UK engaged with Frontex. Over the first three quarters of 2011 the UK also used Frontex controls to detect the crossings of Albanians into the UK on intra-EU flights following the visa liberalisation of Albanian nationals. The refusal of entry for Albanians was detected as an issue for Frontex due to the increased workloads of border guards (Frontex, Q3, 2011). The UK using a well-established control structure is a positive and interesting for two main reasons, firstly operations can be taken at a reduced cost as monies spent on operations can be split between all those that take part. Secondly it allows UK politicians to spread the accountability if operations fail to reduce the number of illegal immigrants entering the UK. The first positive is self-explanatory, however the idea of being able to place accountability onto other actors in the field is evidence of manipulation. Manipulation was identified by using the fifth code *UK using regional mechanisms to control migration for the Euro-Med area,* the regional relationships it has built afforded the UK a dominant negotiating position. It is a sign of habitual behaviour by the UK to spread accountability. Firstly, because it means other members of the external migration control field can be seen as incompetent and if they lack a higher position within the field already it has the potentially to be damaging to its reputation. During 2011 this is particularly evident due to the number of different perceived threats to the external border. Greece was painted as a scape goat for many member states during this time as they lacked the financial or legal structures in which to competently deal with the number of migrants crossing during the Arab Spring. The manipulation of a field of control is a way of securing your position at the expense of an others (Riker, 1986). The UK has also used the Frontex to attempt to gain respect within the field of external migration control through the number of effective returns it completes. Previous to 2012 there was

little discussion within the Frontex data regarding the numbers of returns and the EU member states which executed the most returns (Frontex, 2012)

In Q2 of 2012 Frontex reports that there were 67, 891 third country nationals that were subject to removal either by administrative or court order. The UK was the member states which ordered the most returns alongside Greece and Italy. For the effective return of third country nationals the number was slightly lower at 40, 299 and the UK conducted the largest number of returns, mainly to India and Pakistan. The difference between returns and effective returns is standard returns are orders either made by the judicial system or by the Home Office that could be ignored by the migrant. These orders do not always turn into effective returns because they are either appealed or the migrant in question absconds. Effective returns are perceived as more important because they actually remove the migrants from the states where they are then taken to an agreed safe third country or their state of origin. Effective returning of illegal migrants from member states has the potential to gain a member states a better position within the field. If a state is seen as an effective returner they can build a better reputation. Established through bilateral relations and the use of EU structures the UK can return migrants more effectively. By raising their position in the field in one area of external migration control it allows the UK far more freedom to go against the other norms of the field. It becomes a play off between the UK not adopting all the norms of movement that the EU have built up and adopted but it secures its reputation through effective returns.

Joint operations have been briefly mentioned in the above discussion of Frontex reporting however this section will focus on the joint operations that the UK have participated in, some of which it has also led. The UK has taken part in these joint operations since 2006. The operations it takes part in are either framed around the prevention of migrants entering the EU and potentially onwards to the UK. The data on the operations is limited due to the secrecy around military intelligence behind the creation of such agreements. The number of operations the UK has is 66 out of a total of 286 and the number the UK has led is 5. The operations it has taken part in tend to play to the strengths for example JO Poseidon (2006, although it was also repeated in 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010) which was a maritime operation that was "combating illegal immigration across the maritime borers of Member States of the EU" (Frontex, JO Poseidon 2006), the aim of the operation changed little year on year but it did change its location to the various focal points that Frontex concentrated on across the Mediterranean. The UK headed up two operations in 2010 called Nigeria (one which it hosted with Ireland). The aim of the operations was "to assist member states to jointly organize the return of person's subject to an individual removal order from the territory of EU/Schengen Associated countries to their country of origin" (Frontex, 2010). These operations were not undertaken solely by

the UK they also included the participation of: Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Sweden, and Slovenia.

The active participation of the UK with so many other states does on the one hand show a level of cooperation but also is evidence of manipulation. If the UK was a true co-operator it would do so at all levels of governance that the EU set as norms of the field. However, participation in operations that will reduce one of the largest migrant populations in the UK could be viewed as a selfish act. As discussed above in relation to the statistics in the Frontex reports the UK dominates the field of external migration control in relation to the return of migrants. The joint operations also expose that the UK actively uses Frontex in order to reduce the number of migrants that make it to the UK and to improve the effective return of third country nationals from the UK back to their country of origin. This awkward relationship between taking part in some parts of external migration control and not in others is a strange juxtaposition, which leads to the conclusion that the UK is out to manipulate the filed. Bourdieu would understand this as the UK gaining capital where it can in order to better its position in the field (Jenkins, 2002). What this research develops is the concept that manipulative behaviour which could also be described as habitual behaviour by Bourdieu, the idea that manipulation changes an actor's position in the field mirrors Bourdieu's concept of habitus.

A consideration to make when discussing if there is evidence of manipulation is to see if the evidence illustrates if manipulation occurs within all levels of migration control. The UK's unstable relationship with the EU is juxtaposed with periods of cooperation (see Cooperation chapter). However, the historically constructed field of external migration control in which the EU is most dominant can be challenged by particular member states. This is nowhere more evident than the relationship that the UK and the EU have. There are many examples where the UK and the EU have broken away from the historically constructed norms of the field (O'Dowdsmit 2003, Duff 1997 and Eilstrup-Sangiovanni et al 2006). However, the most widely discussed example is the rejection of the Schengen agreement by the UK. The UK rejecting Schengen was a blow for the integrity of the region. The whole ethos behind the EU is member states that are similar enough to find agreements across all areas of politics (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni et al 2006). What the UK managed to do was position itself very cleverly within the field of external migration control, it managed to create a position in which it was indispensable to the control of migration in terms of the funding it offers other EU actors in the field.

From this position it can now easily manipulate EU policy at a domestic and regional level. Firstly, it would be best to define what is meant by manipulation of EU controls at a domestic level. The manipulation of EU policy at a UK domestic level is the UK legislature actively using "loop holes" in EU agreements for domestic gain. This gain can be categorised as either political, less immigration is

perceived by the UK electorate as a positive action, or financial, less immigration would mean a reduction in processing costs and welfare costs. "Loop holes" in EU agreements are areas of the policy which are vague or open to abuse by member states. Welfare provision is an area of politics which is controlled by national legislation therefore the EU has very little influence over decisions made unless it effects EU citizens. This is where domestic member states policies have to be mindful. The rights of EU citizens are bound by EU law. Any member state found contravening these laws can be prosecuted by the EU. However, the rights of external migrants and refugees, although bound by particular international conventions such as the UN Humans Rights Charter, are controlled by the state. In the first reading of the 2014 Immigration Act in the House of Commons (10th October 2013) the discussion over the use of EU legislation was quick to appear. On page 4 of the draft the use of biometric information was called an "enforceable EU right" protected under the 1972 Communities Act. What is most interesting is the use of the language by the writers of the Bill. Enforceable is a strong word often associated with negative connotations. If you are having to force an action on a migrant this is possibly going to be against that migrants will.

The EU policy behind the collection of biometric data was principally to ease the movement of third country nationals that have gained a visa in one-member state and they wish to move to another member state. Primarily it was to make moving between member states that have signed the Schengen agreement easier. By using this right, the UK collection of this biometric information is manipulating the primary function of the EU right given to them by the most dominant member of the field. However, the use of identification is manipulated in other ways by the UK government. On page 13 of the first draft there is a discussion around the adoption of EU rules in reference to EU identity documentation. A number of member states use identification cards. These cards can be used in lieu of passports to gain entry into other member states and have other functions such as eligibility to the welfare system of their country of origin. Within the first draft of the 2014 Immigration Act the use of these cards to limit access to housing and banking services was outlined. What the UK have managed to achieve it the use of an EU structure that was not even designed for this purpose. "Throughout the EU, some 30 million national eID cards are used by citizens to access a variety of public services such as claiming social security and unemployment benefits or filing tax returns." (EU, 2008). This description contradicts what the UK is using the identity cards for. The UK is using them as proof for access to the private sector not the public sector, where migrants could be mistreated by businesses and landlords. The UK is using them to make the it more difficult for illegal immigrants that have made it through at a port or have overstayed previous visas to live in the UK. There is also evidence in the same document that the UK judicial system uses EU structures to aid deportation.

This you may think is not an unusual act however they are not using a piece of deportation policy they are using the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) to help deport immigrants they have deemed to be illegal. The use of the ECHR never made it to the final draft of the Act however the fact that it was discussed is of great consequence. It is evidence that the UK will attempt to use every structure the EU has to control the number of immigrants to the UK even if the primary use of that structure is altered. A fact that was exposed during the House of Lords debate of the act. On page 172 the discussion centred on the obligation of the UK to the ECHR but that the House of Lords were using it to gain political ground. Manipulation of a convention that is there to protect the rights of human beings seems insensitive. Moreover, the UK is extremely clear on what it is and is not willing to sign up to.

A Notice of Amendment demonstrated this very well: "this section applies if Her Majesty's Government has agreed to the terms of an EU accession treaty" (2014, page 9). If the UK are following doxical behaviour patterns they would not use this language. It would be a presupposition that the UK would automatically agree to the terms rather than there being a question mark above such an action. What the UK are demonstrating here is a habitual behaviour trait. As discussed before habitual behaviours are evident when an actor is attempting to shift their position within the field. Manipulation of the ECHR is an extremely under handed way of producing an outcome it feels happiest with. For example, the number of illegal immigrants goes down thus pleasing the electorate and outwardly demonstrating to the EU that there are certain structures the UK are willing to agree to and apply to domestic level policy.

Continuing the theme of habitual behaviours manipulating the field an example is the restrictions over Bulgarian and Romanian migrants. In the marshalled list of motions to be moved on consideration of Commons reasons and amendments, MPs explicitly quote the European Communities Act Number 2, Article 20 and Annexes VI and VII as allowing the UK government to restrict Bulgarian and Romanian migrants until 31st December 2018. This is further supported in a document issued by the Home Office *Immigration Bill – ECHR Memorandum*. The document states that the key principle of the ECHR is that it does not guarantee the right of an alien to enter or reside as long as state adheres to regional and international obligations they have the right to control entry (Notice of Amendment, 2014). This is not an isolated case where the UK has demonstrated attempts to only tentatively agree with EU structures, something which was a key feature of the 2014 Immigration Bill. It was also evident in the *Faster, Fairer, Firmer* report produced by the then Labour government in 1998. They admit to only being interested in the EU if it is in the national interest to do so:

"Various rights to opt into such co-operation in a flexible way so as to preserve our particular approach when necessary while also participating in those areas of co-operation which we judge as important"

and

"At EU level, the Amsterdam Treaty provides for co-operation in the development of minimum standards on the reception of asylum seekers. The government will participate in the development of such co-operation if it is in the national interest to do so."

UK Government, 1998, page 16 and 35

The discussion within this document kept reiterating the need to cooperate when needed but the ultimate goal is to preserve national controls and to keep maintaining national level policy such as strengthening the Immigration (Carriers Liability) Act 1987 (page 24). The two sections from the document above illustrate that bilateral and multilateral cooperation will only occur if the UK agrees that it is in the national interest. As Jenkins discusses in his book *Pierre Bourdieu* (2002) the field is "a social arena within which struggles of manoeuvres take place over specific resources or stakes and access to them" (page 84). Riker argues that; "it is always possible to manipulate the outcome by manipulating the agenda" (1986, page 110). If the UK can take charge of the agenda by Riker's estimation they will be able to manipulate it. However, the manipulation that occurs between the UK and the EU in the field of external migration control is much subtler, but is it necessarily negative? The next section will discuss if UK manipulation benefits the field rather negatively effecting it.

Manipulation of practices and structures is evident through the analysis and explanations given in this chapter so far. The argument has centred that the UK manipulates and either it causes a negative reaction from the EU or the UK's position within the field is compromised. However, what if the EU allows the UK to be manipulative order for it to a) remain the most dominant actor and b) to allow the UK to believe it has more power that it actually has. The EU, as the external migration control fields dominant actor, allows the UK to act in an authoritative position because it means they do not take more evasive action against the stability of the field. This is currently evident in the negotiations for the UK's position with the EU. (Which will be further explored in the conclusion). The manipulation of EU structures could also be considered as the only way the UK will engage with the region. If the UK was not "allowed" to manipulate or their manipulation is ignored the EU can still benefit from the UK itself. There is a great benefit to the EU in terms of the jobs, services and education sectors. Brexit would ultimately mean that of the UK left then EU citizens would not have access to these or access would be expensive or tightly controlled.

Bourdieu talks about habitus housing the interest or the capital of an actor in any given field (1984). The habitual behaviour of manipulation by the UK could be seen as beneficial for both the UK and the EU. The biggest positive is the economic input by the UK into structures such as Frontex. The UK has continually contributed to the finances of Frontex, an indication that its submission to the doxa of securitization is evident in its relationship with the actor. This habitual behaviour by the UK of course is a bonus for the EU. It means the EU through Frontex can fund more operations and controls to reduce the number of migrants crossing over the EU's external border. As discussed previously, the work done by UK the take part and lead particular joint operations is not only beneficial to the UK it is arguably as beneficial for the EU. The other consideration is what if the EU is conscious enough to actually allow the UK to push against the norms of the field in order to gain the most from having them within the EU.

Manipulative Cooperation

The concept of manipulative cooperation counters the idea that the UK manipulatives purely for reasons of gain. Manipulative cooperation still has elements of selfish gain however it also has a deeper notion that the UK is attempting to develop a position in the field which it is happier to occupy. For example, at a summit between the UK and French authorities it was agreed that there would be a joint intelligence unit created in Folkestone, UK. In a joint statement issued by the states they said:

"At an International and European level we will work together to mobilise our partners within the framework of concrete and operational cooperation, both in the fight against illegal immigration, and in relation to asylum."

Declaration on Immigration, 2010, page 2

This declaration of working together has many positives for the UK government. Firstly, having the control centre on UK soil gives the government an upper hand in terms of the operations the unit may decide to operate. Secondly, it demonstrates that unlike the effect of manipulation on domestic policy which shows the UK as unable to interact with the EU at any level, unless it perceives it to be worthwhile, and potentially damaging the field of control. The consequences of the field collapsing could be the dismantling of the Schengen structure to large numbers of undocumented migrants travelling unchecked across the region. Bilateral agreements offer the UK a unique opportunity to use valuable resources without a great financial outlay. This is also demonstrated in the agreement the UK has with the Belgium government on the immigration controls on rail traffic between Belgium and the UK under the *UK/Belgium: Agreement concerning immigration controls on the Channel Tunnel* 2014. The UK managed to use its semi dominant position in the external migration control field to

negotiate a deal whereby UK immigration officers would be present at the Eurostar check in area in a newly created "secured safety zone". These zones are clear areas of train stations which are not publicly accessible. It integrates standard border controls into commercial ticket controls. Within the secured zone there would exist another area in which UK immigration officers will perform their duties. These controls do not impact passengers which are intra Schengen or those whose destination is the UK only. This seems a rather benign agreement however further within the document it displays the UK as the more dominant actor. Article 5 of the agreement states that if the UK refuses admission authorities in Belgium cannot refuse readmission therefore passing the responsibility of that migrant back to the Belgium authorities. The same applies to an immigrant that states they are intra Schengen when they are not.

What is interesting about this article is that Belgium readmits immigrants that should have been detected by UK authorities within a "secured safety zone". What the UK has managed to achieve is cooperative manipulation. It is outwardly portraying an image of cooperation whilst actually benefiting from shifting the accountability to other actors. Not only is shifting the accountability of the illegal immigration a plus point for the UK government but also has the potential to reduce the financial burden of such an interaction. However, this is not a new development. During the negotiations for the Channel Tunnel Agreements the UK managed to secure itself the better advantages. Much of the negotiations that the UK took part in centred on the consideration of the Channel Tunnel being a hot spot for migrants crossing from mainland Europe (Duff 1997). Using the Brussels "secured safety zones" as an example the UK can politically and socially place the blame on other actors for any illegal activity that occurs within this zone. This is a strong and extremely manipulative position to be in and also places a lot of pressure on a member state that does not have the resources to control migration in the same way the UK does. However, the UK is not always so closed off from offering financial support.

Manipulative cooperation is an interesting concept as it means the UK still adheres to the norms of the field that have been a) historically constructed but also b) newer norms that the EU is attempting to impose upon members of the field such as the externalising of border controls to other states, as discussed in relation to the agreement between the UK and Belgium. According to Bourdieu adhering to the doxa of any field is essential because it allows an actor within it to still keep its positon and privileges within it (Jenkins, 2002). This is especially true of the UK as it has a relatively dominant positon within the field of external migration control. This is down to it being a key destination state for migrants but also the policing and military expertise it has in relation to external migration control (see discussion in the Frontex section of this chapter). It is also down to the authoritative position it holds as a previous colonial power and political dominance during the early post war era. It is a unique

position that no other member state holds. Member states such as France and Germany who have worked hard to create the norms of the field do not have the freedom that the UK has. The is down to the position the UK have managed to negotiate for themselves. Its uniqueness is owed to the different UK governments that have managed to create a field of external migration control where the UK has to do very little in terms of adhering to the main norms of the field. It has created a position whereby any positive actions are does take in the field are encouraged however in comparison to other contributions by other member states they have actually achieved very little. An example of this is the way in which the UK has positioned itself in the freedom of movement norm. It has afforded British citizens the best situation of being able to travel, live and work abroad. Currently there are around 2 million ex pats living in Europe, mainly retirees in France and Spain. However, the UK chose not to become part of the Schengen area which was the next development of the freedom of movement concept that had been established in the Treaty of Rome (1957).

This juxtaposition in the relationship that the UK has with other actors, including the EU as an actor in its own right, exposes the manipulative behaviour the UK demonstrates. The manipulation centres on the need for the UK to gain more capital in the field. As previously discussed capital can come in many different forms. The capital for the UK in the field of external migration control is the reduction of migration to the UK. This has many benefits such as economic, less pull on the welfare structures, and political, domestic politicians and parties gaining more popularity when immigration is reduced. However, there is also gain to be made in cooperation with the EU, some of which is access to the standard positives of membership to a political and economic regional bloc but others are less obvious. By outwardly advertising themselves as cooperative the UK is allowed unfettered access to migration control structures that would not be available to it if it was seen to be absolutely non cooperative by the EU as head of the field.

The concept of manipulation creates the question of how deviations in the field of external migration control are managed by the EU. Evidence of this can be illustrated by the current relationship the EU has with the UK. The last UK President of the EU was in 2005 with the next pencilled in for 2017. The current political discussion of Brexit and the refugee crisis are changing the dynamics of the field. Deviating from the field is a dangerous act and can lead to sanctions being placed upon offenders. These sanctions will differ depending on the kind of field an actor is in. In context to external migration control there have been examples of when deviation from the norm was penalised by the head of the field, the EU. An example of major shifts in the field in context to external migration control was the suspension of the Schengen agreement during the Arab Spring. The influx of refugees was so great that member states were unable to control numbers. (There will be further discussion of potential EU sanctions on member states in relation to the most recent/current refugee crisis in the Conclusion).

The suspension of Schengen would not have been taken lightly. As previously discussed the dismantling of internal borders is a key identity marker for member states. It is a historically constructed norm that is key to the foundations of the field as it is part of its fabric as set out in its main treaties.

As Bourdieu discusses what is important to analyse when looking at the relationships that actors have in a field it is not the actors themselves that are analysed it is the structures, identities and behaviours that bind them that hold the greatest importance (Jenkins, 2002). Using the analogy from the Introduction, imagine the field as an electrical circuit it is not the components on the board which are important it is how each component relates to the other and the electricity that binds them all together and makes them work. Deviation in this example would mean something not working correctly on the circuit or its complete failure. The same goes for the field of external migration control. If one actor deviates from the norm it threatens the whole structure. If the deviating actor's in discrepancies do not alter the field in any substantial way, then the behaviour will be largely ignored or very discreetly acknowledged but no negative actions would be taken. This is how the UK manages to not exactly follow norms of the field but maintain a relatively strong position with in the field in terms of decision making and the diplomatic capital (Adler-Nissen, 2008).

Conclusions

In conclusion the manipulation of EU external migration control structures by the UK is evident at all levels of governance. What has been most interesting to reveal from the data is the way in which the EU and its structures were negotiated and the effect that has gone on to have on the use of the EU by the UK in context to external migration control. Manipulation, as seen in this chapter, can come in many different disguises. This is done in a number of ways, firstly the UK's use of regional level mechanisms, secondly the UK using its semi dominant position to hide its deception and thirdly the EU's blindness and/or awareness of the deception the UK uses in order for it to benefit from regional mechanisms and structures. The discussion of repercussions of bad behaviour has also illuminated the complexity of the historic norms that dominate the field of external migration control. What binds the EU and the external control field is a notion that as a group of states they are far stronger against perceived threats than they would be if they were a singular state. Manipulation of these perfected structures should cause disintegration of the structure of a field however the manipulations as evidenced in this chapter shows that experienced members of the field can get away with pushing the boundaries of the field. The UK has manipulated every migration control structure regardless of the level of governance that it comes from. As Bourdieu discusses the capital gained in a field can afford a member a higher position that could give it more power going forward in making decisions. In light

of the analysis in this chapter the UK has been manipulating its position since it joined the EEC in 1972. Throughout the varying changes from a purely economic union to a more globally dominant economic and political union the UK has managed to always get the best deal for itself rather than the best decision for everyone involved. Le Touquet Treaty is ideal evidence of this fact. The UK does not have to have the expense of processing migrants in the UK where they would have the possible opportunity to abscond from authorities. They can instead process them off shore in a state where it does not matter if they abscond as the repercussions would not be dealt with my UK authorities. This one treaty is not the only evidence, as discussed in the chapter the control zones in Brussels highlight that it is not only regional level structures that the UK is willing to manipulate. Overall the UK has historically constructed a manipulative position therefore the behaviour witnessed has simply become normal for other actors in the field, establishing itself from a very early point in EU history as the "awkward partner". This was exacerbated by the key EU treaties being negotiated when the UK had a conservative government. If an actor such as France was to act the way, the UK has there would be a very different reaction in the field. Where does the relationship go from here? The ongoing refugee crisis and the possibility of a UK exit from the EU throw all these considerations into question. However, the negotiation that occurred in early 2016 and the tour that David Cameron did of all the heads of states of the EU show that the UK can still even on the brink of leaving the EU manage to make sure it has the best deal possible through negotiations bilaterally and multilaterally. These considerations will be discussed at length in the Conclusion. The next chapter will demonstrate that cooperation maybe another tool the UK uses in order to maintain its position within the field of external migration control.

Cooperation:

A EU Dream or an Existing Reality

In previous chapters we have explored the concepts of securitization and manipulation. These two concepts can have negative connotations and have the potential to signify the historical erosion of the UK and EU's relationship and foundation of the field. The securitization chapter highlighted the different pace in which the UK and the EU wish to securitize against external migration, including the externalisation of borders. The manipulation chapter took the concept of securitization a step further and explored how the UK attempts to challenge and change its positon in the field. Cooperation, however, is a positive notion that denotes a supportive relationship.

This chapter argues that manipulation and securitization are not the only behaviour the UK demonstrates. For a field to function cooperation is key in maintaining the balance and stability between the actor that control the field and those that contribute to it. Unlike the other concepts that have been explored, cooperation has the ability to stabilise and evolve a relationship between multiple actors or in the case of this research the UK and the EU. The focus of this chapter is to explore the cooperation that has evolved from the Maastricht Treaty (1992), analysis of pre 1992 documentation can be found in previous chapters. Cooperation is not a word often associated with these two actors. The UK is viewed as an actor which antagonises the relationship between itself and the EU (Colonelli, 2015) and from this position it can manipulate or change the structure of the field by not adhering to norms. However, this is a one-dimensional view of the relationship between the actors and this chapter will illustrate that cooperation is more present within the field than a difficult relationship that is more commonly used.

The Oxford English Dictionary definition of the word is "The action of cooperating, i.e. of working together towards the same end, purpose, or effect; joint operation" (OED, 2015). This definition shows the importance that cooperation is often to gain the same advantage or conclusion. External migration control is one of the only political issues that gains the same reaction from all member states (EU, 2015). The rhetoric from both actors is to control external migration. The reaction is normally reactionary and is similar across all member states. An example of which is the restrictions placed open Romanian and Bulgarian migrants after their accession (The Migration Observatory, 2014). An external migration example is the increase in spending through mechanism such Frontex as number of migrants crossing the EU's southern border increases at specific junctures such as the Arab Spring. Frontex Joint Operations will be explored in greater detail later in this chapter. This section of the

thesis will explore the cooperation that the UK and the EU exhibit through their policy documentation. It is significant to explore and illustrate the levels of cooperation that are evident between the two actors because it has the potential to change the way in which the field of external migration control in the EU is viewed as currently the UK rhetoric is not that of cooperation with the EU.

Regional Cooperation through Bilateral Agreements

It is important to analysis the different levels in which there is evidence of cooperation between the EU and the UK. Bilateral agreements offer an interesting cross section of the relationship between the two actors because it reveals the subordinate relationships that maintain the field at a domestic level. The media coverage of the 2014 Immigration Act and Theresa May's ferment support of the Act as a decisive move towards a new era of state dominated control of external immigration control. As previously discussed in the Securitization chapter, the period leading up to the creation of the Act had been filled with a significant strengthening of the external migration control rhetoric. Whilst the media circus focussed on the UK based policy there were bilateral agreements that signified a continuing cooperation. In a document titled *Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium, Concerning Immigration Controls on Rail Traffic between Belgium and the United Kingdom using the Channel Fixed Link* (2014) both governments came to agreement on the best solution for external migration passing through the Channel Tunnel. The agreement is yet to be fully ratified however offers an important insight into the cooperation that exists in a time when, particularly when UK narrative, generally negative towards other actors in the field. It demonstrates that the cooperation in the field of external migration control is strengthening rather than weakening. At the beginning of the text it is outlined that the agreement is in line with all other bilateral and regional agreements concerning external migration control. One of the most important sections of the document reinforces that the agreement is not inclusive of passengers which are intra Schengen and whose destination is the UK only. This is of particular importance because it means the two actors are cooperating over a larger cohort of migrants rather than simply one identifiable group such as intra EU migrants.

Article 5 of the policy outlines the roles of the actors which is that if the UK refuses admission the Belgium authorities may not refuse to readmit a refused migrant. This also stands if an immigrant completes a journey to the UK after stating they were an intra Schengen migrant and they were found to be dishonest upon reaching the UK. From an archetypal perspective this would indicate that the UK is abusing its superior position within the bilateral and regional relationship by not assessing a refused migrant themselves on UK sovereign territory. However, there are other considerations to be made in regards to this document. Within the agreement there is a plan to have a "secured safety zone" (page

4) which are clear areas of train stations which are not publicly accessible and border controls will be integrated into commercial ticket control. A clearly marked "control" zone will house an area in which UK Immigration Officers can perform checks on Belgium territory. This demonstrates a balance in the relationship because both actors are suppling support for the project in order for external migration to be controlled thus following the norm of the whole field.

Similarly, a summit between the UK and France on the 2nd November 2010 produced a comparable agreement. *The Declaration on Immigration* (2010) is an example of how the UK also maintains its relationship with other actors in the field of European external migration control for example maintaining a specialised task force at Dover: "The creation of a Joint Intelligence Unit in Folkestone, dedicated to the fight against illegal immigration networks, has brought together British and French specialists and has allowed the exchange of information between our police forces to become standard practice" (gov.uk, 2010). Agreements on a smaller scale like this and the agreement with Belgium demonstrate how the dominant narrative of the field impacts upon more intimate relationships between non dominant actors. It gives opportunity to validate the constructed norms of the field and emphasis their importance. "At an international and European level we will work together to mobilise our partners within the framework of the concrete and operational cooperation, both in the fight against illegal immigration, and in relation to asylum" (2010) this was further enforced with comments such as "implementation of effective co-operation and "promote respect" (2010) in context to external migration specifically.

The previous document details co-operation at a bilateral level, inclusive of regional agreements such as the Lisbon Treaty and existing Benelux agreements (Benelux represents Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg). However, investigation of the 2014 Immigration Act transition through parliament demonstrates to us a different aspect of the UK government. It is key to point out that simple investigation of a policy document that has been given royal assent is not sufficient enough to find evidence of cooperation. Cooperation will only be found throughout the progression of the bill as considerations that could potentially affect the UK's relationship with the EU will be taken at its creation and evolution through parliament. Evidence of cooperation at all levels of governance demonstrates how powerful the field is when controlling the behaviour and actions of actors within it. "There is no major area of public policy that does not feature at least to some extent on the EU's agenda" (Nugent and Paterson, 2003, page 94). The power that the EU has as the head of the field and the structure that has been created around that power mean the EU features very heavily in all level of external migration control When the norms and dominant narratives seep down into national level governance it is clear that they are well established and respected by all actors within the field because they continue to be adhered to.

The Home Office Asylum Policy Instruction – EEA/EU Asylum Claims Version 2.0 May 2014 gives guidance to how the Home Office will consider asylum of human rights claims from EEA, EU and Swiss nationals (EEA is inclusive of all EU member states as well as Lichtenstein, Norway and Iceland). The policy guidelines are that asylum claims from the EEA and Switzerland must be considered. However, EEA regulations from 2006 say there are some circumstances where claims can be certified. The beginning of the document claims that this regulation is unsupported because an asylum claims from a citizen of and EU member state is clearly unfounded. However, as the document progresses it states that claims made by EU, EEA and Swiss nationals must be processed by officers accredited to make non suspensive appeal decisions. The document states that this ruling is made in accordance with obligation to the Protocol on Asylum for National of Member States of the EU or is also called the Spanish Protocol and that officers will "inform EEA/EU nationals of their free movement rights when they are not subject to removal action" (page 4). As well as confirming that these rules are in accordance with the existing Spanish Protocol they also list all the other policy it adheres to:

- Immigration (EEA) Regulations 2006
- Accession (Immigration and Worker Registration) Regulations 2004
- Accession (Immigration and Worker Registration) Regulations 2004 SI 2004/1219
- Accession of Croatia Regulations 2013
- The Immigration Rules;
    - Paragraph 339NA (omission of substance interview)
    - Paragraph 339M (circumstances under which the Home Office can flatly refuse an asylum claim)
- UK Borders Act 2007; foreign national offenders with sentences of 12 months or more are subject to automatic deportation.

All of these different regulations demonstrate the level of cooperation at a domestic policy level. The more regulations and policy that the UK adhere to the more conscious they are of their position and a better standing when there are negotiations for new legislation. There is legislative need for the rules the government are "inviting claimants to withdraw their claim or provide written submissions (page 16). However further down the paragraph the government are keen to illustrate that they are bound by UK law and by EU law for EEA/EU claims to be protected under the right of appeal just like any other claim. Even when the UK appears to be diverging from the norms of the field it quickly reinforces that it does support the EU.

Cooperation between the UK and the EU has never been settled. From the initial rejection in 1961 by Charles de Gaulle who believed the UK in the EEC would bring too much influence from the US to possible Brexit, the UK and the EU have almost constantly contested one another's position. The situation worsens when you have a Conservative government in power as they are more restrictive of external migration (Partos and Bale, 2015). Cooperation was the opposite of the mandate that the Eurosceptic coalition government were campaigning for. The mandate of the Conservative party during the 2010 election was to improve on the past governments mistakes and distance themselves from the EU. The 2014 Immigration Act had some of the most significant changes to immigration policy since the 1971 Immigration Act. The Act as discussed previously in a former chapter increased restrictions on migration from the Commonwealth and made it more complex for dependents of migrants that already lived in the UK to follow their relatives. The 2014 Act did not explicitly make external migration harder however it intended to make living in the UK illegally much harder by restricting access to banking and housing. Many of these changes had the potential to be in direct violation of EU regulations and laws. However deeper investigation of the Immigration Act's path through parliament illustrated a different faction of the UK government. It reveals the UK is extremely conscious of following EU norms and adhering to the doxa that has been historically established by the EU from the Treaty on Rome onwards. Within the external migration control field, or within any field of power, it is extremely important that actors adhere to the norms set by whoever is the most powerful. Disruption within a field of power can mean erratic changes in well-established norms or within the context of international relations possibly military action or regional instability.

Overall EU stability is key to the maintenance and reproduction of the external migration control field. One such document which demonstrates the UK seeking to cooperate with the EU *is Faster, Fairer, and Firmer – A Modern Approach to Immigration and Asylum* (July, 1998). It was presented by Jack Straw (the then Home Secretary) to the House of Commons as a means of addressing concerns surrounding the A8 states (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia) accession that had been agreed during the negotiations of the Treaty of Amsterdam. Jack Straw was determined to highlight the key benefits of immigration: "International travel is of enormous economic and social benefit to this country and reflects the United Kingdom's position within the European Union" (page 4, 1998). This says little about the UK's position in terms of migration control but what it explicitly states are the UK's conscious decision to mention their position within the EU. Other statements like: "The government is also committed to implement European Community (EC) provisions on free movement for EC citizens" (page 16, 1998) exhibits the UK's continued support of the doxical behaviour of free movement. This small section of text is not enough to reflect the depth of the UK's commitment to cooperation regarding the external migration control

field. *Faster, Fairer, and Firmer* (1998) goes into greater detail around the commitments made by the UK in relation to external control. "We were the first country to ratify the Europol convention and supported the decision to give Europol a role in combatting illegal immigration… we shall continue to strengthen cooperation of this kind" (page 15-16, 1998). This display of support for newly created EU structures identifies the UK as a key factor in the creation of new norms in the field. This offers them a better position in which to manipulate the field but also demonstrates how quick the UK is to fall in line with new norms that are founded by the head of the field, the EU.

Evidence such as the support of Europol coupled with the domestic use of the ECHR in the period of 1998-1999 signifies a significant shift in the habitus created by the UK. Unlike supporting schemes and structures such as Europol, the adoption of policy shows evidence that the relationship is in far more established field. Cooperation can often be fragile if the relationship or behaviour is not supported by accompanying policy or some sort of official signed document. Simple differences in the terms used can signify cooperation in a relationship. Speech acts are more significant the more they are repeated. Within the document the UK reiterate the difference between sovereign frontier defences and EU defences which supports the change in language that was happening at this point of time in the history of their relationship. It was in the period of time that the Amsterdam Treaty was signed that agreed the accession of the A8 states and the early working groups that would go on to establish FRONTEX had been created. What were habitual behaviours previous to this point were now becoming doxical. Evidence of the doxical behaviour of cooperation is further supported by another statement made within the *Faster, Fairer, and Firmer* (1998) document. "Various rights to opt into such cooperation in a flexible way so as to enable us to preserve our particular approach when necessary while also participating in those areas of cooperation which we judge as important" (page 16, 1998). This statement demonstrates the UK's want for cooperation however it still demonstrates the importance of preserving sovereign controls. This supports the idea that whilst the UK is willing to cooperate it is often at the expense of deepening the lines of cooperation and maintaining its own sovereign position. (These behaviours and concepts are better explored throughout the manipulation chapter).

Cooperation and the significance it has on actor's relationships within the field on control depends on the depth and breadth that cooperation can be witnessed. This is especially true of an institution such as the EU. The various structures that have been constructed since the Treaty of Rome (1957) have created many different ways in which other actors of the field connect with the wider regional structures in the field. It can mean that a member states or other actors that engage with the EU will interact with it at all levels from national police forces taking part in small operations to multilateral policing operations on a much larger scale. Cooperation at all levels is key to maintain stability in the external migration control field. Bourdieu discusses that the doxical and habitual behaviours of actors

in a field is the glue that holds that field together (Adler-Nissen, 2012 and Bourdieu, 2015). Cooperation as a doxical behaviour means that trait has been learnt, an unconscious submission to the doxa. It will also be more likely to spread across all areas of the institution and/or structure as the historical relationship becomes more established. This is evident within the *Faster, Fairer, and Firmer* document. The UK demonstrates support on multiple level not just the top line EU interaction such as participation in the European Commission and/or Parliament. "We supported a recent Council of Europe recommendation encouraging member states to provide effective remedies before removing a failed asylum seeker" (page 33, 1998). It is also significant in so far as they have also positioned themselves as a means of encouraging other actors to also cooperate with the recommendations made by the most dominant actor of the field, the EU.

Cooperation is evident in a multitude of statements made in the document:

"The UK has also supported an EU resolution on unaccompanied minors who are nationals of third countries" (page 33, 1998).

"At EU level, the Amsterdam Treaty provides for co-operation in the development of minimum standards on the reception of Asylum seekers. The government will participate in the development of such cooperation if it is in the national interest to do so" (page 35, 1998).

"Including improved cooperation with our European Partners" (page 44, 1998).

"Experience among EU member states has been of particular relevance" (page 45, 1998).

Such an abundance of language within the document and the references to national interest demonstrate how important the UK views their position within the field. Cooperation can also be evident in the roles that actors take on within the field. "The presidency is responsible for driving forward the Council's work on EU legislation, ensuring the continuity of the EU agenda, orderly legislative processes and cooperation among member states" (consilium.europa.eu, July 2015). The presidency of the EU gives the key role of a co-operator on a rotational basis. The UK has taken on the role of the EU presidency 5 times in the past 13 years. It allows for single member states to take a superior role within the EU. It does not mean whomever has the presidency has any actual power to change structures within the institution but it does have the power to pressurize other member states to consider legislation that the presidency favours. In context to external migration control it allows states to introduce or push for legislation that may have been struggling to get heard. "We particularly promoted during the UK Presidency of the EU" (page 45, 1998). The key area which the UK promoted was the cooperation of EU member states to improve and evolve the structures which process the return of undocumented migrants to their countries of origin or safe third countries. During this period

(1997-1998) The Dublin Convention, agreed upon and signed in 1990 but did not come into force until 1st September 1997, and over 1000 asylum seekers had been returned to safe third countries. From the Dublin Convention the EURODAC regulation was also established which created the EURODAC system. The system is an EU wide data system for asylum seekers fingerprints to be stored and became fully operational in 2003, around the same time that Frontex became fully functional. The regulation states that "when someone applies for asylum, no matter where they are in the EU, their fingerprints are transmitted to the EURODAC central system" (ec.europa.eu, June 2015). The combination of so many different structures means that cooperation between those that control or contribute to these structures are more likely to engage with them. If they did not the structure would collapse or become unstable. The 2014 Immigration Act demonstrates the effect of these structures on national policy making and the knock on effect to cooperation within the field of external migration control.

Cooperation is not only present through regional level mechanisms such as Frontex but also domestic structures. The UK has played an active role in the creation on doxical and habitual behaviours in relation to EU governance of external migration through domestic mechanisms. Gallagher (2003) discusses the cooperation that the UK has built between itself and its closest EU partners in relation to controlling the ports in the south of Britain. The creation of the European Liaison Unit (ELU) in the early 1990s as part of the Kent Police Force was unique to the UK. The unit was set up because of the exceptional positon of Dover and influence of "geographical, historical, economic, legal and the social factors and the complexities of trans-frontier police cooperation" (Gallagher, 2003). The unit was seen as a success and Interpol regarded the structure as a template for other police forces that wished to develop bilateral or multilateral relationships with other police forces across Europe (Gallagher, 2003).

2014 Immigration Act: Following the Norms

More recent experiences of the politics of external migration control would have you believe that cooperation is no longer a key priority for the UK government. From the election of the coalition government of David Cameron and Nick Clegg in 2010 cooperation seemed extremely far off. Not only in the context to external migration have control but also a possible complete exit of the UK from the EU. Prior to the drafting of the 2014 Immigration Act there has been a growing trend of securitization towards external migration (which has been discussed in the previous chapters). The act was a change to the immigration policy in the UK. However, the transition of the act demonstrates a much deeper understanding of the regional impact, both of the UK on the EU but also of EU structures on UK legislature.

At its original introduction (10th October 2013) Members of Parliament (MPs) were conscious in ensuring that the Act fell in line with EU norms and policy. Pages 12-14 of the Immigration Report

discussed the importance of "taking influence" from the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) and reiterating that EEA citizens are "relevant nationals" to consider especially in context to the strengthening of external migration controls. One could take this for granted as simply a given and argue that of course the UK would consider EEA nationals as relevant. However, it is essential that an actor like the UK is explicit within the intention of new policy when the relationship with the head of the field is at stake. An example of which is a clause specifically outlining that EEA (European Economic Area) nationals are not liable for investigating regarding sham marriages which is in line with "subordinate legislation" from the EU (Immigration Report, 2013, page 39). Simply using the word subordinate reinforces the hierarchical nature of the external migration control field. In the early stages of the House of Commons Parliamentary Readings, this was reinforced by discussions on the importance of any new legislation being aware of the pressures of EU migrant's rights. These examples show a submission by the UK government in the production of new legislation in context to the doxa external migration control field. There were far more subtle ways in which the UK government demonstrated cooperative behaviour. Evidence can be found of this in the discussion of migrants claim to the UK welfare system. MPs discussion centred on the contributory period before a migrant can claim UK income related benefits discussed how we compared favourably with other EU member states. These smaller mentions of how structures are alike signify a deeper level of cooperation.

From subtle ways in which the UK demonstrate cooperation you can see some of the smaller more entrenched levels of cooperation to larger demonstrations of solidarity. The biggest act of cooperation the UK demonstrated throughout the progression of the Bill was the consideration of the ECHR and the UK's obligation to its conventions. In the House of Commons debate the ECHR was called a "valuable tool" (page 129). The pressures of adhering to EU jurisdiction on domestic policy making was highlighted. This demonstrates the UK's willingness to follow the doxa of the field Structures such as the ECHR have been highly controversial in the UK. The Guardian newspaper reported "David Cameron is committed to "breaking the link" between the European court of human rights and the supreme court to ensure the UK's highest court remains the "ultimate arbiter of human rights", Downing Street has said" (The Guardian, 1st June 2015). Outwardly the support for the ECHR has diminished since the General Election in 2010 however closer analysis of the 2014 Immigration Act reveals a far deeper appreciation for the established structures of the EU and a willingness to continue a cooperative relationship. Cooperation was a theme which ran through a number of different documents that supported the progression of the Act through both houses of parliament to Royal Assent in May 2014. One example was the House of Lords readings which mentioned the UKs obligation under the ECHR, in particular Article 8. Just in this one document ECHR obligations were mentioned sixteen times. Article 8 of the ECHR specifically looks at the right to private and family life.

"Article 8

Right to respect for private and family life

1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic wellbeing of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

European Convention on Human Rights, 2010, 7th Version

It is a core value of the EU and it is key that the UK follows this norm as it is a foundational right of European citizens and of migrants who settle here. The original ECHR was established in 1957 so it has been significant for the entirety of the EU's time as the most dominant actor in the field. Its significance is cemented by the length of time it has remained unchanged since its conception. As Jenkins argues core values of the field gives actors within it legitimacy but more importantly it values are the capital which the field uses to gain respect (2002). Adhering to a core value such as the right to private and family life gives the UK diplomatic capital. Adler-Nissen argues that this is capital is invaluable when it comes to regional negotiations (2012). The House of Lords not only muted a need to adhere to the UKs obligations under Article 8 of the ECHR but also to engage with the EU and its member states bilaterally and multilaterally on the issue of reception directives and asylum seekers access to the labour market. What is more interesting however is the impetus for the UK to restrict a migrants time in detention. The UK has no upper limit on the time a migrant can spend in detention unlike other core member states, France has a limit of 45 days and Germany 3 months. One Lord claimed that the UK was grossly underperforming in regards to the detention of migrants and was not in line with EU or UN mandates. There was a distinct push for the UK to follow the norms of the EU. This was reflected in the Impact Assessments of the Act which illustrated the full integration of EU norms into UK legislation making. "Does the implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements" is the statement that appeared in each Impact Assessment. One could argue that it is insignificant however the use of the term beyond minimum shows a continuous need to almost please the head of the field a trend that extended through the majority of the documents.

Cooperation through Regional Mechanisms

What has been discussed so far is the UK cooperating with the EU from a passive position of a national policy making. However, there is also evidence of UK engagement with regional level structures away from the national debate surrounding external migration control. Regional level cooperation is

significant because it is evidence of the UK acting correctly through doxical and habitual behaviours at all levels within the field. Frontex is one such mechanism in which the UK demonstrates it cooperation with other member states.

Frontex promotes, coordinates and develops European border management in line with the EU fundamental rights charter applying the concept of Integrated Border Management. Frontex helps border authorities from different EU countries work together. Frontex's full title is the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union. The agency was set up in 2004 to reinforce and streamline cooperation between national border authorities."

Frontex, 2015

As its mission statement shows it is an EU structure which is there to facilitate cooperation. The UK's involvement with Frontex has been from the very beginning of its conception. As discussion earlier in the evaluation of the *Faster, Fairer, and Firmer* (1998) document see the beginnings of UK interest in regional border controls. This is not to say that the field of external migration control did not exist before but the manifestation is evidence of habitual behaviour of actors rather than doxical. Cooperation between member states when dealing with external migration control as a regional power has always had mixed results. More often than not internal differences render negotiations difficult and time consuming. However, the evolution of Frontex from a number of ad hoc centres to full external migration control structure was well managed with all member states including the UK seeking to ensure that Frontex was a success. "The objective of this project is to strengthen the EU external border by using modern search technology to combat illegal and, in particular, clandestine immigration" (2003). By having a common goal, the cooperation was strengthening thus making the field stronger as was as more effective external migration control which is beneficial for all actors.

The UK was directly involved with the early stages of Frontex. The EU designed each ad hoc centre to be specialised in a particular field of external migration control. For example, the German Centre for Land Borders in Berlin was "for exchanging personnel and implementing common operations in selected points of the external borders, in order to harmonise and improve the practices of the competent national units, with Germany as the leading country" (Frontex, 2003). The UK had a different role to play the Centre for excellence in Dover was "for developing new technologies to facilitate controls at border crossing points and their surveillance, with the UK as the leading country" (Frontex, 2003). Engagement at the early stages of an EU managed structure is important to the perception of behaviour by the UK in the field by other actors within it. When early structures are established the behaviour is still habitual and not set meaning that actors within that field can

compete to be head of that field. The ad hoc centres represent the early stages of a sub field of EU external migration control. An early dominate position in the sub field could mean a greater dominant position in the main field. The UK has shown evidence both directly and indirectly either through management of an entire program or through funding of particular projects. The UK's initial proposal to the other ad hoc centres was to use technological expertise acquired through the work achieved by the centre, pooled with similar expertise from other Member States, to conduct specific short-term operations at the external EU border, managed from a virtual centre at Dover, where the majority of our expertise is located (Frontex, 2003). An example of this project is:

"Project Denizis a UK-led, intelligence-focused project that seeks to take proactive enforcement action in Turkey, a major source and transit country for illegal maritime migration, and against the organisers behind it… The UK is meeting most of the costs of this project… The fact that the UK has initiated the project, and will certainly retain primacy in securing delivery notwithstanding any wider EU involvement, should give us opportunities to build further influence in the area".

Frontex, 2003

The expansion of the ad hoc centres to a fully functioning sub structure of EU external migration control was gradual and by June 2010 Frontex was producing quarterly and annual reports. These reports are key to understanding the focus of Frontex during periods of high external migration from North Africa. They form part of the risk analysis undertaken by the institution and have detailed qualitative and quantitative data. Frontex FRAN (Frontex risk analysis) Quarterly and Annual reports house some of the most comprehensive data surrounding the movement of migrants, their origins and the method in which they entered the EU. Analysis within the document goes beyond that of evaluating the institution in isolation it also explores the impact of domestic member state policy on the wider framework of Frontex. For example, the FRAN Quarterly, April – June 2010 discusses the widespread decline of illegal immigration as being down to the Europe wide recession causing a decrease in the employment opportunities. The recession also had a knock on effect to the migration and asylum policies of member states. "Stricter migration and asylum policies in Member states, supported by much more effective collaboration with key third countries" (page 3, Frontex Q2, 2010). The UK and Norway were particular advocates of stricter controls at this time which has been discussed in the securitization chapter. However, you cannot simply view this statement as evidence of securitization. If the actions are the same across the whole field of control you have evidence of cooperation. For Bourdieu if there is a norm that is adhere to by the majority of field then it is either doxical or habitual. Cooperation exists in both spheres of behaviour.

The sharing of information is also evidence of cooperation in a field. Quantitative data of the number of visas issued and entry/exit figures are important with in the field of external migration control in order to be proactive or reactive in managing migratory flow. Management is a key area of cooperation in any political situation however it is greatly significant in migration control. If movement, including the issuing of visas can be controlled pre-entry to a sovereign state you reduce the risk of migrants overstaying visas and reduce the domestic administrative costs.

"In 2009, 7% of the 11, 310, 000 EU visa applications were rejected (the rate for the UK visas was 19%). This proportion rose to 22% for applications made in Africa (25% for UK visas) and to 14% in South America (14% for UK visas issued on the American continent"

(Page 11, Frontex Annual Risk Analysis, 2011).

A simple glance at these statistics would tell you that the UK rejection rate for visa application are higher than that of the Schengen area member states. However, the use of the data is more interesting than the data itself. Frontex is predominantly an external migration control structure which service for the security of Schengen member states. The UK is not part of the Schengen area therefore the statistics from the UK of the percentage of overall and regional visa rejections should be a moot point. The significance of the inclusion of the data demonstrates the position of the UK in the external migration control field. It is evidence of a much greater role within the control of migration in the Mediterranean than perceived from the national narrative in early 2011.

2011 was a turbulent year for external migration control, especially for Frontex, as well as other actors in the field. The political changes and civil unrest in North Africa during 2011 saw a rise in the number of migrants and asylum seekers crossing the Mediterranean. The figures for migrant and asylum seekers crossing were unprecedented especially in the winter months when migration tends to drop because of harsher weather conditions effecting movement. The numbers were the highest on record peaking at 41, 245 in Quarter 2 2011 (April-June) almost doubling the number previously recorded in the same period of 2010 which was 26, 878. These numbers are only representative of the numbers that were recorded, unofficial estimates have the numbers much higher into the hundreds of thousands. At this time the Frontex quarterly reports took a very different approach to the data that they showed. They became much more focused on migrants using false documents and the returns statistics of member states. From a simple analysis this demonstrates that the focus of the member states has changed because of political circumstances in neighbouring states there for reactive reporting for this period would be the norm. However, it represents a much deeper change in political activity surrounding migration control. The killing of Gadhafi in Libya meant that many member states, in particular Italy and the UK lost an ally in North Africa in terms of migration control. The two

European states have loosely relied upon Libya to control the popular migration route out of Tripoli, used by a large number of migrants including citizens from sub Saharan Africa and South East Asia on route to Europe. Cooperation was vital at the point in time, however cooperation was not always what was demonstrated by actors. The Schengen area was suspended for a short period of time in 2011 and member states seemed to be pulling each other apart instead of joining together. However, a common narrative did appear and was evident through the active returns policies of member states.

"In Q3 2011 a total of 37, 701 third country nationals were effectively returned to third countries. Of this total forced returns accounted for just 54%. The UK returned the most third-country nationals with over a quarter of the total (9, 940), followed by France (3, 747), and Greece (3, 639). Member states varied a lot in terms of the proportion of forced returns to voluntary returns. For example, the number of voluntary and forced returns from the UK were roughly equal, while in Greece all returns were forced."

(Page 26, Frontex Q3, 2011)

Key issues such as returns are important within the field of external migration control. They are habitual behaviours that are demonstrated by members of the field. They are habitual because they are subject to relatively quick changes depending open the return directives of states and regional actors. The UK has demonstrated in the above citation that they are the most effective member state at returning illegal migrants. They have also demonstrated that their returns directives with third countries are also more superior because they have fewer forced returns than a state such as Greece. What this does is raise the UK within the field of migration control. If a state shows that it is effect in controlling returns and has effective returns system, then it can make habitual behaviours develop into doxical behaviours for future administrations and leaders. Effective returns became increasingly important from the period of Q3 to the present day. The Q4 report from 2012 shows evidence of the UK demonstrating dominance in setting the habitual behaviour for the external migration control field. "The UK was the member state conducting the largest number of returns, in this case by 5% compared to the previous quarter" (page 39, Q4 Frontex, 2012). "The UK conducted the largest number of returns in this case up by 7% compared to the previous quarter" (page 34, Q1 Frontex, 2013). The reports even state that the UK has been the member state to always have the highest number of returns (forced and voluntary). Bourdieu understands that habitual behaviour will allow an actor to gain more respect with the field. The UK in regards to the EU external migration control field often finds itself an outsider especially in context to the UK not being a member of the Schengen area and not adhering the Community Code on Visas. Where the UK loses dominance it the field it makes up for it in other areas such as effective returns policy. A dominant position through monetary

contributions (the UK has consistently contributed 9-10% of money given by EU member states) as well as actions such as the joint operations undertaken by participating member states. Joint Operations undertaken by the UK under the banner of Frontex will be discussed later in the chapter.

From Quarter 1 2012 the Frontex Quarterly reports change branding. They move away from reporting about statistical data towards a dominance of securitization language. This follows a trend of domestic securitization in the UK as well, it was during this time that Tier 4 visas became stricter and changes in welfare provisions were outlined. This is significant because Frontex is representative of the member states that either contribute financially or politically to the organisation.

"Frontex helps border authorities from different EU countries work together. Frontex's full title is the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union. The agency was set up in 2004 to reinforce and streamline cooperation between national border authorities. In pursuit of this goal, Frontex has several operational areas which are defined in the founding Frontex Regulation and a subsequent amendment… Frontex also works closely with the border-control authorities of non-EU/Schengen countries — mainly those countries identified as a source or transit route of irregular migration — in line with general EU external relations policy."

(http://frontex.europa.eu/about-frontex/mission-and-tasks)

A move away from discussing trafficking and smuggling of humans and the smuggling of goods to a discussion on the security of the region and how best to securitise against migration within an external migration control structure as important as Frontex signifies a dramatic shift in focal point for the whole region. The cooperation of the UK with other member states is hugely important when the threat from criminal organisations that arrange the illegal immigration of third country nationals is a multinational structure. In the Q2 2012 report there is a discussion of the break-up of a criminal organisation that facilitated the movement of Iranian migrations through Spanish airports. It is evidence of the distinct need for cooperation in the external migration control field. Member states are able to cooperate because of their submission to the doxa of the field. If Spain and the UK had different attitudes to stopping clandestine migration the operation to stop a criminal organisation would be extremely different as each state would have a different rhetoric and/or answer to solving the issue. The trait of working together is doxical because it has been enshrined in EU policy from the very beginning and has been developed since the Treaty of Rome (the progression of EU policy can be found in previous chapters). Doxical behaviour is evident through many different joint operations undertaken by member states that take part in operations organised by Frontex.

The UK took part in 66 joint operations between 2006 and 2014. The operations were extremely varied between land, sea and air, with a variety of different modus operandi. The first joint operation that the UK took part in was Operation Torino. It participated with: France, Germany, Italy, The Netherland and Spain. The operation's aim was "monitoring threats at the external borders as a result of the increased number of air passengers travelling to the Winter Olympics in Turin. On the 17th October 2007 external border management was discussed by members of the House of Lords. Our cooperative relationship with Frontex was part of the debate of effectiveness of external border controls put in place by the EU and the UK. The UK taking part in external operations at the cost of taxpayer have fallen out of favour, largely due to the economic downturn and negative feelings towards the EU within the UK, especially around the debate of Brexit. The House of Lords with the European Union Committee debated the UK's position within Frontex in a debate on the 17th October 2007. Mr Dowdall who was given evidence within the House of Lords gave this statement on the UK's participations in Joint Operations;

"We consider requests that will come to the UK, as indeed those requests come to other Member States as well, and we make a determination on whether we should get involved in those operations based on the risks that it is seeking to address, based upon the skills that our own people have and there the benefits that we can bring to an operation. But also, because often the requests that come through are not necessarily to deal just with people but also to deal with the provision of the equipment, we will provide some equipment to support those operations."

House of Lords, 17th October 2007, page 43

The statement highlights the key position that the UK plays within Frontex in terms of support and cooperation with other member states. When discussing UK participation in any EU context it tends to have negative connotations. However, this discussion reveals a narrative that is never seen in the media or conversations in the UK. This quotation demonstrates the level of dedication made by the UK on Frontex. It also illustrates a certain level on constraint in terms of the assessment of what operations they would participate in. However, this is not unusual, any actor would consider the benefits and risks of partaking in any international operation. What does show UK level cooperation at a regional level not only passively though policy but also actively through regional mechanisms like Frontex. Participation in activities that include the whole or the majority of the field contribute to the stability of the region it also creates a more effective migration control. The two points are extremely important firstly because stability is essential for speech acts to be more successful. If the field of external migration in the EU is stable with all actors following the norms and cooperating on all levels of migration governance in that field the doxical behaviour of securitization will become embedded.

Participation at a regional level in mechanisms that control migration is good evidence of active cooperation between the UK and the EU. In the discussion above it was conferred that the UK would be approached to take part in joint operations that they deemed would be most appropriate. However, their active cooperation in Frontex goes as far as seeking operations to take part in and heading up operations themselves (see Table 1). An example of the UK actively seeking to take part in Operation Agelaus. The operation was "to raise awareness about and gather data on the entry of unaccompanied minors (under 18) to the EU. Previous lack of comparable EU records meant that before the project, this phenomenon went largely unnoticed" (Frontex, 2007). Mr Dowdall also discussed the UK's participation in Agelaus he said; "Operation Agelaus was actually promoted by one of our officers who is based full time in Frontex" (House of Lords, 2007, page 43).

Table 1

UK led Frontex Operations

Operation Name	Year	Description of Operation
Nigeria	2010	Jointly organise the return of person's subject to an individual removal order to their country of origin.
Nigeria	2010	Jointly organise the return of person's subject to an individual removal order to their country of origin.
Nigeria	2011	Jointly organise the return of person's subject to an individual removal order to their country of origin.
Focal Air Points	2012	Local support for implementation of Air Border activities, enhance organizational capacities and effective operational cooperation with 3rd countries.
Nigeria	2012	Jointly organise the return of person's subject to an individual removal order to their country of origin.
JRO to Nigeria	2014	Jointly organise the return of person's subject to an individual removal order to their country of origin and facilitating harmonized and effective monitoring and achievement of EU directives.

Information taken from http://frontex.europa.eu/

There are two key points to be taken from this statement. The first is that the UK actively promoted participation in a regional level operation and secondly the UK has a full time member of staff stationed within the organisation. The stationing of a full time member of staff within Frontex is an interesting finding, mainly because the UK is only an associate member to Frontex. In the management of Frontex they are invited to attend meetings regarding decisions of the direction of the organisation however they are not obligated to attend. This was put under scrutiny by the House of Lords.

"We have associate membership of Frontex… Whilst we do not have a vote on the board, what I can do it to provide input into the discussion that and debate that takes place at the Management Board… Therefore, we do have an ability to influence the decisions that are taken by the board. The UK operations are well respected and, therefore our view is sought and we are listened to."

House of Lords, 2007, page 40

The discussion within the House of Lords is evidence that through cooperation the UK is able to gain more power through influence within the external migration control field. Bourdieu understands that such a strong position within a field of power means that an actor can influence the behaviours of other actors within the field and have the potential to change the structures of the field, adjusting or reinventing the norms of the field. This is evident when even with associated membership the UK host operations with other full members.

The Joint Return Operation (JRO) to Nigeria was organised by the UK in early 2014. In the documentation supporting the operation Frontex commented on the UK's "readiness to organise" the JRO. The main objectives of the operation were to:

- "Providing added value in the interest of the EU = efficient and effective return by using charter flights.
- Using well developed 3rd Country relations of a Member State and for the benefit of more Member States.
- Optimizing the capacity of charter flights for national and EU benefit.
- Sharing best practices and respecting human dignity when carrying out forced returns.
- Facilitating harmonized and effective monitoring and achievement of EU directives"

Frontex, 2014

Out of the 161 staff that took part in the JRO the UK provided 104 staff. The proportion and dedication of the UK to participate can be viewed in two ways. Either the participation is active cooperation following doxical behaviours or it is manipulative cooperation. The concept of manipulation has been discussed in the previous chapter however there is a fine line between adhering to norms of the field

and using the norms to selfishly gain advantage within the field. Cooperative manipulation is a where the UK is using selfishly using its semi dominant position within the field to attempt to gain more control. This is extremely difficult for the UK to achieve because it does not have full voting rights within Frontex or adhere to a number of EU directives surrounding the control of migration through external borders (such as the EU Returns Directive, 2014). When it can gain any level of control it will pursue that opportunity. As Adler-Nissen discusses capital exchange can change an actor's position within the field. As discussed previously the UK seeks to offer equipment as well as expertise to help Frontex with a number of different operations. This exchange in capital between the UK and an active organisation that controls external migration is evidence of cooperative manipulation. The UK appears to being cooperating at all level of external migration control governance whilst benefiting empirically from a reduction in the number of illegal immigrants in the UK whilst attempting to gain a more dominant position within the field.

Conclusions

Cooperation between the UK and the EU is a well-established behaviour within the field of external migration control. However, this is a phenomenon that was unexpected at the beginning of this research project. Cooperation was a common concept and behaviours that linked all the actors that were analysed but the breadth and depth of the agreed integration was surprising. In this chapter there has been evidence of cooperation at all level of external migration control. What was even more surprising was the level of active cooperation rather than passive. Passive cooperation would be simply following the policy and adhering to structures placed upon them by the EU. Active cooperation is the UK pursuing operations and ways in which to participate in. Throughout this chapter there has been significant evidence to show that the UK actively cooperates with the EU at almost every possible level. The one area in which they do not cooperate is the UK's participation in the Schengen area. However, the UK makes up for this in contributions to external migration control through mechanisms such as Frontex. Passive and active cooperation will inevitably impact on the positon of the UK in the field of external migration control.

Conclusion

This thesis has investigated the external migration control field of the EU. It has considered the different policies and their supporting documents to understand the different the behaviours of securitization, manipulation and cooperation presented by the UK and how this effects its relationship with the EU, alongside other relevant factors such as Frontex. The conclusion will explore the insights gained from the research, discussing the weaknesses and limitations of the research and the new knowledge that has been gained. It will then discuss the unique contributions of this research as well as how this research could be developed for future projects. This conclusion will reaffirm the use of such a complex theoretical approach, illustrating how the complexities of the external migration control field have been unpacked to reveal a deeper understanding of the UK's relationship with the EU in context to external migration control.

Cooperation more important than Securitization?

This project has discovered unique insights into the relationship between the UK and the EU in context to external migration control. Firstly, that the field of external migration control is older than the Maastricht Treaty and the introduction of the third pillar, which is where most of the securitization literature places the beginnings of the relationship. The contextual exploration into historical treaties and legislation enacted by the UK and EU demonstrate that external migration control has been a consideration of both actors much earlier than first anticipated. The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act (1914) and the Treaty of Rome (1957) demonstrate the beginning of the doxical behaviours that we now see in the field. This is important as it means that the doxical behaviours of the UK, EU and the field are far more entrenched then a couple of decades which strengthens them, makes them more difficult to challenge and even harder to change.

Secondly that cooperation is far more prevalent within the legislation, structures and mechanisms than initially thought and at all levels of governance. After analysing the data, such as the 2014 Immigration Bill, Le Touquet and Frontex cooperation between all actors within the external migration control field can be identified the use of Frontex by the UK. The funding of Frontex by the UK is interesting itself, as Frontex was developed to protect states within the Schengen area. Whilst the UK did not have voting powers its decision to lead 6 Joint Operations for Frontex demonstrates a level of cooperation unseen in other areas of the UK and the EUs relationship. It illustrates the UK is willing to cooperate and follow the doxical behaviour of security to maintain a dominant position with the field.

Thirdly acts such as Le Touquet allow the UK to illustrate that they are willing to conform to the doxa and habitus but on their terms and often to their advantage. Manipulation, whilst often difficult to identify, allows for the UK to function within the field of external migration control without having to fully commit to all EU policy, such as Schengen. For the UK this is a relatively powerful position as it can pick and choose which policies and legislation it chooses to adopt. However, one of the most thought-provoking findings from this research is how conscious the UK was of maintaining a good relationship throughout the debates surrounding the 2014 Immigration Bill, for example. Both Houses of Parliament were acutely aware of the structures of the EU when discussing the legislation. It illustrates an awareness albeit at times for selfish reasons of the field that the UK must act within. Another fascinating finding was the mirroring between the developments of Frontex as an external migration control mechanism and how the UK became more involved as these changes went from Frontex being a splintered EU initiative into a larger almost militarised migration control actor. It demonstrates that the UK are willing to cooperate with EU programmes in relation to migration control, however, this is often done by proxy through mechanisms like Frontex and not explicitly seen in their relationship as depicted by the media.

The cooperation of the external migration control field has been witnessed in proxy rather than explicitly in a common policy in reaction to the refugee crisis. It is evidence of a combination of securitization and cooperation creating a buffer zone in which the control can be externalised. The trend of spending money externalising migration control to states which border the EU has been favoured over the resettlement of refugees within the safer environment of the EU. Refugee camps managed by the UNHCR and other charities at the borders of Turkey and Syria, have seen the destabilisation of these areas. Some of the securitization behaviour witnessed has been down to the way in which refugee settlement works in the EU. Once a refugee claims asylum in a state they do not have the freedom of movement rights given to a citizen of the EU. They must remain in that state until the claim for asylum is processed. As discussed in the Securitization chapter the external migration control field norm is to take the fingerprints of refugees whilst their claim is being processed. It allows member states to return migrants that may have absconded from one state and return to where their claim is being processed (europa.eu). Often refugees will have a particular state in Europe which they have in mind to travel to, which is influenced by friends and family which may already be settled there. This can be a lengthy process and the ongoing externalisation practices of keeping refugees settled at camps at the border of Europe is a more palatable situation for members of the field to control. Cooperative securitization is evidence of the influence a field can have over external actors, whether those actors be others states, regions, institutions or groups of people. As well as cooperative securitization, there has been evidence of members of the external migration control field working

together in a more humanitarian effort rather than a security effort. Although the EU as a whole has only taken roughly 6% of the current Syrian refugee population the effort behind fair and even distribution of refugees has been a long process (UNHCR, 2016). The ongoing Syrian refugee crisis is a topic of research that would create an interesting research project as the differing reactions by actors in the field highlight the continuing impact of domestic migration policy on community politics even after 25 years as a political unit.

Unveiling the UK as a Cooperative Actor

Before conducting this research, I was aware of the securitizing behaviours of the UK and the EU in relation to external migration control through previous research that I had conducted during my undergraduate and master's degrees when I looked at the EU's policies around the subject of human trafficking. Alongside this the media portrayal of migration, be it economic, human trafficking, asylum seekers or refugees, has been mostly around the theme of securitization whether that be in country or the externalisation of several controls, especially in the UK with the reconstruction of the UKVI and the UK Border Force. What this research has shown me is that there are other behaviours present in the control of external migration by both the UK and the EU, that shape the policies of both actors more than I conceived previously. Before undertaking my literature review I had only considered securitization as a unit of analysis as this is what had been most prevalent in previous research and my general understanding of the area. However, as I analysed the data, the UK legislature and the Frontex documents, such as the quarterly reports, I found that it was a much more complex web of behaviours.

When I undertook the legislative review that formed much of my contextual chapter I also found that the relationship at a bilateral and multilateral level was more established than I had first conceived. When I first undertook this project, I thought that the Maastricht Treaty (1992) and the introduction of the third pillar would be the start of the relationship between the two actors in context to migration control, however, the contextual reading enabled me to understand that the relationship went further back than I had first thought. This project also demonstrated to me the extent to which the UK involves itself with external migration control. From previous research I understood the overarching involvement of the UK, for example Frontex, however the depth of the research into its relationship with the EU and bilateral relationships with states such as France and Belgium have demonstrated to me the lengths in which the UK will go to protect its borders from external migration.

The prevalence of cooperation within UK legislation and its participation in regional level policies such as the ENP, also challenged the way in which I view the relationship between the UK and the EU. This allowed me to approach the data sets with a much broader outlook rather than simply looking for

securitization language. It has enriched the researched to look beyond what the mainstream literature and narrative provides. Whilst securitization is still an important part of the story, manipulation and cooperation allow for a broader understanding of how external migration control in structured and mechanisms maintained by the UK and the EU.

Deviant or Doxical – The Manipulation of Mechanisms

Manipulation was a core behaviour that arose from the data analysis and out of all the behaviours that this research wished to illustrate, this was the most elusive to find. This was because it is not a behaviour that is encourage by any actor in the field, unlike cooperation and securitization which are widely published and supported actions. The evidence of the UK being a manipulative actor within in the external migration control field was found in two areas; firstly, in bilateral agreements with other EU member state and secondly within its use of mechanism maintained by the EU and other member states, namely Frontex. The two pieces of data that demonstrated this the most was Le Touquet Treaty and the bilateral agreement for secure zones in Brussels with Belgium. They both illustrated that the UK wished to follow the established norm of securitization but wanted to achieve it outside of their borders. This is important because if the UK is seen to be following the norms of the field the most dominate actors are more likely to give the UK more leverage when negotiating multilateral agreements. The agreements also highlighted the UK placing accountability to other actors within the field. For example, movement through the secured zones in Brussels is the responsibility of Belgium authorities and any migrant found to have incorrect documentation or no right to remain will be returned to authorities in Belgium, *not* British border authorities. The continued funding of Frontex and the encouragement of its expansion and development by the UK government is another example of manipulative behaviour. Manipulation is predominantly a doxical behaviour, in the context to this research, manipulation of structures such as Frontex have afforded the UK a position in which it can secure its own borders whilst using resources from other states.

The current political climate between the UK and the EU could see further manipulation of the structures of external migration control. The political fallout from the EU referendum decision could have a profound impact on the external migration control field. To leave the EU, the UK must enact Article 50 to start the bureaucratic processes of leaving. The new Prime Minister Theresa May has yet to reveal a timeline in which this will occur, with some political commentators hinting that it may not be until the end of 2016, some arguing that it may never happen at all (Guardian, 2016). However, there has been calls from France and Germany for the triggering of Article 50 to happen much sooner than the UK. Hollande and Merkel are pushing the May to start proceedings for disruption to the rest of the EU to be minimal (Reuters, 2016). Whatever the inevitable outcome will be, there are several

different ways this could affect the structure of the field. The most substantial would be a breakdown of the field, with all actors reconsidering their position within it. The UK leaving could change the approach in all member states, funding could be taken from projects and the mechanisms of migration control could change irrevocably. This is extremely unlikely to happen the withdrawal of one-member state will not cause a domino effect.

Another scenario would be that the UK remains an actor within the field considering that their decision to leave places them far lower in the hierarchy as their leaving causes whatever diplomatic capital they must disintegrate. This is a far more likely situation as the UK is already afforded special privileges to join joint projects like Frontex as they are not part of the Schengen agreement. The UK also holds several bilateral agreements with EU member states that are unlikely to be affected. However, this is not to say they will not be affected. States that have agreements with the UK may feel they do not wish to uphold arrangements with a state that is not part of the wider community. So, little is known about what will follow in the next few months and years as there is no precedent to look toward. Another scenario could be that nothing changes in relation to external migration management. However, this is another unlikely situation as all policies between the UK and the EU will have to be reconsidered and renegotiated.

The use of mechanisms was highlighted through this research as an important behaviour of actors. The use of national mechanism can highlight habitual and doxical behaviours. The national level mechanism that offered the most evidence of the UK attempting to construct more control over the movement of external migrants over the EU's southern border was the document *Faster, Fairer, Firmer* released by the UK government in 1997 outlining the policies of the new Labour government in which they reiterated their support of future external migration controls by Frontex. The most convincing evidence is the UK using the UKVI to aid Frontex and other member states in the return of migrants that have overstayed visas or are voluntary returners. The use of these mechanisms that would normally be for the sole use of the Home Office and the UKVI however the use of them in a Frontex JO is evidence that the UK will use all levels of governance it can to control migration across the Mediterranean. The use of national level mechanisms is also illustrating the UK's willingness to cooperate to achieve the aims and adhere to the norms of the field. It is a way in which the UK can gain diplomatic capital within the field as well. If the UK is seen to be aiding the securitization of the Mediterranean, then it will be given respect by other members of the external migration control field. If the UK ever need to then use other mechanisms that it did not have initial access to then it has manipulated a position where it can negotiate to use other actor's structures when it suits them. Frontex JO's are a key element of the examination of the UK's behaviour as the original conception of Frontex was to protect the borders of states that had signed the Schengen Accord, which the UK was

not a signatory. The UK negotiating a position onto the board of Frontex is evidence of its diplomatic capital and it's wanting to gain a superior position within the field of external migration control.

The deployment of EU practices by the UK illustrates the complex structures of the field and the extension of sovereign control to regional powers and external states in North Africa. Within the Cooperation chapter there was a discussion around the Barcelona Process and the ENP, these are ways in which the external migration control field extend their control into neighbouring states. Through these processes actors within the field can control external migration from North African states, alongside passing sovereign controls to actors outside of their territories. For example, the encouragement of North African states to participate in economic activates with the EU comes with the caveat that they must help to stem the flow of migrants. As discussed in previous chapters, these agreements are not always at a multilateral level they can also occur at a bilateral level. This has been illustrated in the negotiations that took place between the UK and Libya and Italy and Libya, as discussed earlier in the thesis. Members of the external migration control field do deploy EU practices to extend sovereign control to North African states, however the structures of control as explored in the data demonstrate the external migration control field is more interested in retaining sovereign control within the field. This is because that states within the field are nervous to give up sovereign control to the EU, let alone to actors that do not adhere to the norms of the field. Externalising sovereignty is habitual behaviour that is only used when it is a last resort for the field to gain control during periods of temporary high migration from North Africa.

What has been demonstrated in this thesis is the (re)structuring of sovereignty can be witnessed in the behaviours and relationships of actors in the field of external migration control. If we use Bourdieu to explain the influence of migration controls, we can see that over many years of negotiations and policy building the UK has retained much if its own sovereignty, but small amounts have been given away for them to maintain a good position within the field. Acts such as Le Touquet Treaty give researchers glimpses of the attempts of the UK to maintain a regional position in which they can be respected however this comes at the price of losing a small amount of sovereignty. Another example would be the UKVI offices that are run by private companies are entrusted with the responsibility of controlling who crosses the border. Sharing intelligence through Europol and agencies such as Frontex are evidence that the UK is willing to restructure its sovereignty to follow the norms of the field. Across the EU sovereignty has been restructured in a similar way with controls being externalised to allow for migration checks to happen pre-entry into the free movement zone. The Securitization chapter explored data that showed how member states and the EU as whole are seeking to expand migration controls out to neighbouring states. Another example that has been demonstrated throughout the whole of this thesis is the EU's reliance on Frontex to police its borders. The evolution of Frontex from

a scattered group of small agencies into the large-scale policing force, arguably a military force, that we see today is evidence of a restructuring of the sovereign boundaries of the EU.

The evidence that has been discussed illustrates that the UK cooperates with the EU, even if it with manipulative tendencies. This research has revealed behaviour that has largely been ignored as the normal rhetoric is the UK's poor relationship with the EU, however the evidence presented has illustrated that this is not the case in context to external migration control. This has been demonstrated through discussing that the UK is willing to adhere to the norms of the external migration control field, either by offering financial support to mechanisms like Frontex or by creating domestic policies that support its position within the field. Even manipulative behaviour is evidence that the UK is willing to hold it position within the field, or even try to improve to through capital gain.

Cooperation is Key

This project has given me a unique perspective in several different ways about the UK and EU's relationship in context to external migration control. Firstly, the UK deploys and utilised EU structures and mechanism to control migration control far more than generally understood. This also is intertwined with the history between the two actors in regard to migration control over the past 100 years. These learnt doxical behaviours have more hold over the actions of the UK and contribute to the creation of domestic as well as bilateral or multilateral legislation and policy. Alongside this the UK is far more open to cooperating with its European counterparts, as contrary to media beliefs the same end goal of curbing external migration into the EU, in particular from North Africa and the Middle East. Whilst the right wing narrative in the UK views migration control as a domestic issue which should only be legislated domestically in reality the control on migration posits all levels of governance for the UK. The use of Frontex is at the forefront of this in so far as the involvement and participation in operations through a mechanism that was not even designed for the UK is a particularly unique perspective. The depth of analysis in regards to the Frontex reports and the participation of UK in JOs is unique to this research and affords it a view into how ingrained the behaviours of securitization are for the UK.

Looking In from the Outside

The theoretical approach and framework of this thesis should go on to develop IR theory more broadly. I believe the development of IR theory has stagnated and the advancement of the use of theoretical frameworks from outside the discipline, such as Bourdieu, can evolve the way we think about international relations. The concept of using a field as an analytical format could be applied to many different areas of IR research, such as environmentalism and terrorism, particularly if you are

looking to analyse the relationship between different actors and the structures that keep them together. Beyond that I think Bourdieu would develop the how we think about the structure and agency model. The concepts of doxa and habitus allow us to look at not only how constructed norms form the world around us but also that in the right conditions that these structures can change if the field allows it. The concept of capital, in all forms discussed throughout the thesis, could change the way in which we view diplomacy, not only as a tool for an actor to gain but as part of a wider exchange of multiple forms of capital across a complex field. From this PhD there should be a wider and more honest conversation about external migration control and the extent to which the UK engaged with EU structures, especially Frontex. Firstly, within the academic community as so much of the literature remains within the category of securitization. What this thesis has shown is that there are more behaviours that have as much as a contributing factor to the advancement and maintenance of migration control structures and mechanisms. Behaviours such as cooperation and manipulation have as much of an impact on the relationship between the UK and the EU therefore need to be considered alongside more dominant themes such as securitization. Secondly within the media narrative as so much information published around external migration control in and around Europe is subjective and led by political narrative it is imperative that a more open discourse is started.

Weaknesses and Limitations

There are weaknesses and limitations to this research. Firstly, this research does not pull apart the complexities of human movement. It only looks at human migration rather than looking at it in all its factions such as, economic migration, asylum seekers, refugees and human trafficking for example. Whilst this does not undermine the findings of this research it does mean that we still do not understand if the behaviours of securitization, manipulation and cooperation are applicable to all human movement or whether there is a spectrum of behaviours that could be attributed to each classification of migration. A limitation of this research is that is does not compare the UK with another EU member state such as France or Germany to see if these behaviours are unique just to the UK. However, as the UK has such a unique relationship with the EU it would be challenging to analyse the policies of other states in relation. Ireland, Norway and Iceland are perhaps the most obvious choices as they are also not part of the Schengen Agreement. Another limitation of this research is that it only explores external migration, whilst this is a limitation I think it would be another large scale research project that would need to undertake this work. I think that the theoretical and methodological frameworks would be replicable to analyse internal migration control and it would afford and interesting comparison to see what the differences are in the doxical and habitual behaviours.

Current Climate

This research has primarily focused on external migration that moves from North Africa into Europe. Although the analysis has only reached to 2014 it would be ignorant to not discuss the current refugee crisis. This section of the conclusion will offer a small commentary on the current crisis in relation to this piece of research then have suggestions on the possible policy outcomes and future research that could be conducted around this area. Firstly, the response from the field of external migration control will be examined. As in previous chapters the field of external migration control is made up of actors and structures which maintains the controls that have evolved. What has been witnessed over the past 18 months is a continuation of previous trends as discussed in this thesis. Securitization has been the main priority for all those within the field. This has been for several reasons firstly the nature of the migration and the countries of origin where they are travelling from. Much of the movement has been Syrian refugees fleeing the ongoing civil unrest. The figures for the numbers moving have been unprecedented, especially during the winter when crossing the sea and land borders becomes even more dangerous due to extreme weather conditions (Frontex ARA, 2016). Growing Islamophobia in Europe and ISIS links to recent terrorist bombings and attacks in Paris and Brussels has fuelled the societal unease about the settlement of refugees which has influenced the political policy towards the current crisis (RT, 2016). This has driven the securitization practices of the field. It has also allowed for newer actors to take more of a pivotal role in the actions taken towards external migration control and continue the doxical behaviour which has dominated the field which in turn reinforces that this behaviour is correct to the rest of the field.

The closure of much of the Eastern European border alongside the reduction of naval aid for refugees has added to the negative securitizing reaction of the field. Much of the "on the ground" response has been to confront the current crisis with military personal rather than with aid workers. The reduction of naval aid through control mechanism such as Frontex works against several the norms witnessed in the field previously (Frontex ARA, 2016). Frontex had been used as a mechanism which would put people the journey of travelling across the Mediterranean however the reduction reflects the reactive policy making the external migration control field. It is evidence of the doxical structure of the field changing. As previously discussed doxical changes occur when the field is pushed to make drastic changes to its normal behaviour. This has been reflected in the relatively small number of refugees that have been accepted by European states and a sluggish international effort for settlement of refugees from Syria. Of the current 11.8 million displaced persons from Syria, Europe has only settled 6% of that number (Al Jazeera, December 2015). The focus to keep refugees at camps at the borders in non-member states such as the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey has been favoured. The media has also followed the securitizing practices of society and the state by naming the current refugee crisis, a migrant crisis. This stokes the practices of states by allowing them to hide

behind a common narrative of simply dealing with large number of migrants rather than explicitly with refugees.

Future Research

The framework from this research could be used again for a post-doctoral project in which the proceeding months up to the referendum and those after it are analysed to assess the impact on the external migration control field. This research would follow on from the work discussed in this thesis, analysing policy documentation from 2015 onwards from all actors of the external migration control field. From this you would be more likely to be able to predict the future of the field. You would also be able to witness any disintegration in the field on the run up to the referendum as campaigning may have had a negative effect on the diplomatic capital of the UK.

From this research there several avenues of future research. The first would be to look at other areas of EU policy in which there could be crossover, such as environmentalism and terrorism. Whilst these are newer areas of research it would be interesting to see if the analytical framework functions in other policy areas. Another area of research would be to look at other areas of human movement such as the US-Mexican border and how that effects both actors behaviour bilaterally and multilaterally through trade agreements such as NAFTA. The application of the theoretical framework would work well on a case study such as this because it would allow a researcher to understand how the doxa and habitus has been formed and how they continue to effect the production and maintenance of migration controls across Central and North America. Another avenue for future research would be to investigate the behaviour of manipulation in a lot more detail. I think this a vastly under researched area of IR and would create interesting interdisciplinary research between the field of Psychology and IR and could be applied to several areas of IR research.

Bibliography

Abbott, Kenneth W., and Duncan Snidal. "Hard and Soft Law in International Governance." International Organization, vol. 54, no. 3, 2000, pp. 421–456. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/2601340

Adamson, F.B. (2006) 'Crossing borders: International migration and national security', *International Security*, 31(1), pp. 165–199. doi: 10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.165.

Adler-Nissen, R. (ed.) (2012a) *Bourdieu in international relations: Rethinking key concepts in IR*. New York: Routledge.

Adler-Nissen, R. (2012b) *Why international relations theory needs Bourdieu*. Available at: http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/23/why-international-relations-theory-needs-bourdieu/ (Accessed: 27 September 2016).

Aho, C.M. (1994) 'Fortress Europe', *The Columbia Journal of World Business*, 29(3), pp. 32–39. doi: 10.1016/0022-5428(94)90045-0.

Allen, A. (2010) *European citizenship – aggregate report qualitative study EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP – CROSS-BORDER MOBILITY aggregate report European commission*. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/cross_border_mobility_aggregate_report_082010_en.pdf (Accessed: 4 September 2013).

Anderson, J. (2001) *Theorizing State Borders: 'Politics/Economics' and Democracy in Capitalism*. Available at: https://www.qub.ac.uk/research-centres/CentreforInternationalBordersResearch/Publications/WorkingPapers/CIBRWorkingPapers/Filetoupload,174417,en.pdf (Accessed: 27 September 2014).

Anderson, J. and O'Dowd, L. (1999) 'Borders, border regions and Territoriality: Contradictory meanings, changing significance', *Regional Studies*, 33(7), pp. 593–604. doi: 10.1080/00343409950078648.

Andrijasevic, R. (2010) 'DEPORTED: The right to asylum at EU'™s external border of Italy and Libya', *International Migration*, 48(1), pp. 148–174. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.2009.00554.x.

Assem, A. van dem and Drent, M. (2012) 'The institutionalization of the European security field: securitization and Bourdieu's theory of power and practice', UACES. .

Bade, K.J. and Brown, A. (2003) *Migration in European history; Trans. By Allison Brown*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Baldwin-Edwards, M. (2006) '"Between a rock & a hard place": North Africa as a region of emigration, immigration & transit migration', *Review of African Political Economy*, 33(108), pp. 311–324. doi: 10.1080/03056240600843089.

Balzacq, T., Léonard, S., & Ruzicka, J. (2016). 'Securitization' revisited: theory and cases. International Relations, 30(4), 494–531. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117815596590

BBC (2011) *In full: David Cameron immigration speech*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-13083781 (Accessed: 9 September 2015).

Berling, T.V. (2012) 'Bourdieu, international relations, and European security', *Theory and Society*, 41(5), pp. 451–478. doi: 10.1007/s11186-012-9175-7.

Bialasiewicz, L. (ed.) (2011) *Europe in the world: EU Geopolitics and the making of European space*. Farnham, United Kingdom: Ashgate Publishing.

Bialasiewicz, L. (2012) 'Off-shoring and out-sourcing the borders of EUrope: Libya and EU border work in the Mediterranean', *Geopolitics*, 17(4), pp. 843–866. doi: 10.1080/14650045.2012.660579.

Bialasiewicz, L., Dahlman, C., Apuzzo, G.M., Ciută, F., Jones, A., Rumford, C., Wodak, R., Anderson, J. and Ingram, A. (2009) 'Interventions in the new political geographies of the European "neighborhood"', *Political Geography*, 28(2), pp. 79–89. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2008.12.002.

Bigo, D. (2000) 'When Two Become One: Internal and external securitisations in Europe', in Kelstrup, M. (ed.) *International relations theory and the politics of European power, security and community*. London: Routledge, .

Bigo, D. (2002) 'Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the Governmentality of unease', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27(63), pp. 63–92. doi: 10.1177/03043754020270s105.

Bigo, D. (2011) 'Pierre Bourdieu and international relations: Power of practices, practices of power', *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), pp. 225–258. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-5687.2011.00132.x.

Bigo, D. (2014) 'The Mobius Ribbon of Internal and External Security(ies)', in Albert, M., Jacobson, D., and Lapid, Y. (eds.) *Identities, borders, orders rethinking international relations theory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, .

Bloch, A. (2002) *The migration and settlement of refugees in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boer, M. den (2008) 'Immigration and its effect on the security discourse in Europe: Time for Demystification', *Amsterdam Law Forum*, 1(1), pp. 53–64.

Boswell, C. (2007) 'Migration control in Europe after 9/11: Explaining the absence of securitization', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45(3), pp. 589–610. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5965.2007.00722.x.

Boswell, C. and Geddes, A. (2010) *Migration and mobility in the European Union*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Philippe Bourbeau & Juha A. Vuori (2015) Security, resilience and desecuritization: multidirectional moves and dynamics, Critical Studies on Security, 3:3, 253-268, DOI: 10.1080/21624887.2015.1111095

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2014) *On the State: Lectures at the College de France, 1989 - 1992*. Polity.

Bourdieu, P., Accardo, A. and Ferguson, P.P. (1999) *The weight of the world: Social suffering and impoverishment in contemporary society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Clough, L.C. (1996) *The state nobility: Elite schools in the field of power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Nice, R. (1986) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P., Nice, R. and Bennett, T. (2010) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Bourdieu, P., Thompson, J.B., Raymond, G. and Adamson, M. (1991) *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brettell, C.B. and Hollifield, J.F. (eds.) (2008) *Migration theory: Talking across disciplines*. 2nd edn. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

British Nationality Act (1948) .

Buzan, B., Waever, O. and de Wilde, J. (1997) *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Campesi, G. and EUI, C. (2011) 'Borderscapes of imperial Europe: Space, law and politics at the european periphery', *Lo squaderno : explorations in space and society*, 22, pp. 21–27.

Castles, S. and Miller, M.J. (2003) *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. 3rd edn. BASINGSTOKE: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cerna, L. and Wietholtz, A. (2011), 'Immigration and immigrant policy-making in the United Kingdom', in G. Zincone, R. Penninx and M. Borkert (eds), *Migratory Policy-Making in Europe*.Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Ceyhan, A. and Tsoukala, A. (2002) 'The securitization of migration in western societies: Ambivalent discourses and policies', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 27(1 suppl), pp. 21–39. doi: 10.1177/03043754020270s103.

Chapman, J. (2010) *Labour's betrayal of British workers: Nearly every one of 1.67m jobs created since 1997 has gone to a foreigner*. Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/election/article-1264333/GENERAL-ELECTION-2010-Under-Labour-nearly-UK-jobs-taken-foreigners.html (Accessed: 2015).

Cho, E.H. (2010) 'Whose borders? Regulating migration across local and national boundaries', *Stanford Journal of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (SJCRCL)*, Volume VI (2010)(Issue 1), pp. 165–182.

Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P. (1996) *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. 6th edn. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cohen, A. (2011) 'Bourdieu hits Brussels: The genesis and structure of the European field of power', *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), pp. 335–339. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-5687.2011.00137_3.x.

Coleman, M. (2007) 'Immigration Geopolitics beyond the Mexico?US border', *Antipode*, 39(1), pp. 54–76. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2007.00506.x.

Collinson, S. (1994) *Europe and International Migration*. London: Pinter Publishers for Royal Institute of International Affairs, London.

Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons (2012) *Lives lost in the Mediterranean sea: Who is responsible?* Available at: https://assembly.coe.int/CommitteeDocs/2012/20120329_mig_RPT.EN.pdf (Accessed: 24 March 2013).

Corbin, J.M. and Strauss, A.C. (2008) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Costello and Hancox (2016) *The UK, the common European asylum system and EU immigration law*. Available at: http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/datavisuals/the-uk-the-common-european-asylum-system-and-eu-immigration-law/ (Accessed: 29 September 2016).

Council of Europe (1972) *Official Journal of the European Communities*. .

Council of Europe (1977) *European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers*. .

Council of Europe (1979) *Official Journal of the European Communities*. .

Council of Europea (1985) *Official Journal of the European Communities*. .

Czaika, M. and Haas, H. (2014), The Globalization of Migration: Has the World Become More Migratory?. Int Migr Rev, 48: 283-323. doi:10.1111/imre.12095

Czaika, M. and Vargas-Silva, C. (eds.) (2012) *Migration and Economic Growth*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Czempiel, E.-O. and Rosenau, J.N. (1989) *Global changes and theoretical challenges: Approaches to world politics for the 1990s*. 2nd edn. New York, NY, United States: Lexington Books.

De Rivera, J. (1968). The psychological dimension of foreign policy. Columbus, Ohio, C.E. Merrill Pub. Co. http://books.google.com/books?id=xbNCAAAAIAAJ

Declaration on Immigration (2010) UK-France Summit: .

Deer, C, 2008, Doxa, in M Grenfell (ed) Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts, pp 118–24, Durham: Acumen

Denzin, N.K. (ed.) (2006) *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.) (2011) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dey, I. (1993). Qualitative Data Analysis: A User Friendly Guide for Social Science. London: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203412497

Drewry, G., Garton Grimwood, G. and Wood, E. (2004) 'Immigration and Asylum: Law and Policy in Action', in Giddings, P. and Drewry, G. (eds.) *Britain in the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 199–217.

Duff, A. (1997) The Treaty of Amsterdam (London: Federal Trust)

Eagleton-Pierce, M. (2009) 'Examining the Case for Reflexivity in International Relations: Insights from Bourdieu', *Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies*, (1), pp. 111–123.

Eeckhout, P. (2005) *External relations of the European Union: Legal and constitutional foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. (2014) 'Europe's Defence dilemma', *The International Spectator*, 49(2), pp. 83–116. doi: 10.1080/03932729.2014.910728.

European Union (1992) *Maastricht Treaty*.

European Union (1997) *Dublin Convention*. Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:41997A0819(01)&from=EN (Accessed: 29 September 2016).

European Union (2004) 'Council Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004 Establishing a European agency for the management of operational cooperation at the external borders of the member states of the European Union', *Official Journal of the European Union*, .

European Union (2013) *European commission - PRESS RELEASES - press release - EU action in the fields of migration and asylum*. Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-862_en.htm (Accessed: 2 December 2015).

Fielding, N. and Fielding, J. (1986) *Linking data: the articulation of qualitative and quantitative methods in social research*. Beverly Hills and London: Sage.

Flick, 2007, 'Qualitative research designs', in Designing qualitative research, Qualitative Research Kit, SAGE Publications, Ltd, London, pp. 36-50, [Accessed 22 August 2019], doi: 10.4135/9781849208826.

Frontex (2006a) *Archive of operations - Gate of Africa*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-operations/YzxDwK (Accessed: 2014).

Frontex (2006b) *Archive of operations - Hera I*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-operations/0kKDfl (Accessed: 2014).

Frontex (2006c) *Archive of operations - Poseidon*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-operations/RQx2fC (Accessed: 28 September 2014).

FRONTEX (2007a) *Archive of operations - Agelaus*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-operations/lAz1Qo (Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2007a) *Archive of operations - Hydra*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-operations/W6AzYZ (Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2007b) *Archive of operations - Long Stop I*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-operations/WHLEzh (Accessed: 28 September 2014).

FRONTEX (2007b) *Archive of operations - Torino*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-operations/8i8z0a (Accessed: 2014).

Frontex (2010a) *ARA 2010*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/Annual_Risk_Analysis_2010.pdf (Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2010b) *FRAN Q1 2010*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q1_2010.pdf (Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2010c) *FRAN Q2*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q2_2010.pdf (Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2011a) *ARA 2011*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/Annual_Risk_Analysis_2011.pdf

(Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2011b) *FRAN Q1 2011*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q1_2011.pdf (Accessed: 28

September 2014).

Frontex (2011c) *FRAN Q2 2011*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q2_2011.pdf (Accessed: 28

September 2014).

Frontex (2011d) *FRAN Q3 2010*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q3_2010.pdf (Accessed: 28

September 2014).

Frontex (2011e) *FRAN Q3 2011*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q3_2011.pdf (Accessed: 28

September 2014).

Frontex (2011f) *News - Hermes operation extended*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/news/hermes-operation-extended-OWmwti (Accessed: 28 September

2016).

Frontex (2012a) *ARA 2012*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/Annual_Risk_Analysis_2012.pdf

(Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2012b) *FRAN Q1 2012*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q1_2012.pdf (Accessed: 28

September 2014).

Frontex (2012c) *FRAN Q2 2012*. Available at:

http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q2_2012_.pdf (Accessed: 28

September 2014).

Frontex (2012d) *FRAN Q4 2011*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q4_2011.pdf (Accessed: 28
September 2014).

Frontex (2013a) *ARA 2013*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/Annual_Risk_Analysis_2013.pdf
(Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2013b) *FRAN Q1 2013*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q1_2013.pdf (Accessed: 28
September 2014).

Frontex (2013c) *FRAN Q2 2013*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q2_2013.pdf (Accessed: 28
September 2014).

Frontex (2013d) *FRAN Q3 2012*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q3_2012.pdf (Accessed: 28
September 2014).

Frontex (2013e) *FRAN Q4 2012*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q4_2012.pdf (Accessed: 28
September 2014).

Frontex (2014a) *ARA 2014*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/Annual_Risk_Analysis_2014.pdf
(Accessed: 28 September 2014).

Frontex (2014b) *FRAN Q3 2013*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q3_2013.pdf (Accessed: 28
September 2014).

Frontex (2014c) *FRAN Q4 2013*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q4_2013.pdf (Accessed: 28
September 2014).

Frontex (2014d) *Joint Operation Focal Points 2013 Air*. .

Frontex (2014e) *JRO to Nigeria by United Kingdomon 28.01.2014*. .

Frontex (2016a) *FRAN Q4 2015*. Available at:
http://frontex.europa.eu/assets/Publications/Risk_Analysis/FRAN_Q4_2015.pdf (Accessed: 19
September 2016).

Frontex (2016b) *Frontex*. Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/about-frontex/origin (Accessed: 29
October 2015).

Gallagher, A., & Holmes, P. (2008). Developing an Effective Criminal Justice Response to Human
Trafficking: Lessons From the Front Line. International Criminal Justice Review, 18(3), 318–343.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567708320746

Garlick, M. (2006) 'The EU discussions on extraterritorial processing: Solution or conundrum?',
International Journal of Refugee Law, 18(3-4), pp. 601–629. doi: 10.1093/ijrl/eel014.

Geddes, A. (2003) *The politics of migration and immigration in Europe*. London: SAGE Publications.

Geddes, A. (2008) *Immigration and European integration: Beyond fortress Europe?* 2nd edn.
Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Geddes, A.P. (2000) *Immigration and European integration: Towards fortress Europe?* Manchester:
Manchester University Press.

Ghezelbash, D. (2018). Refuge Lost: Asylum Law in an Interdependent World (Cambridge Asylum and
Migration Studies). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108349031

Gibbs, G., Flick, U., Kvale, S., Angrosino, M.V., Barbour, R.S., Banks, M. and Rapley, T. (2007)
Analysing qualitative data (qualitative research kit). 6th edn. London: Sage Publications.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative
research.

Glover, N. (2011a) *Does security exist outside of the speech act?* Available at: http://www.e-
ir.info/2011/10/09/does-security-exist-outside-of-the-speech-act/ (Accessed: 26 June 2014).

Glover, N. (2011b) *Does security exist outside of the speech act?* Available at: http://www.e-
ir.info/2011/10/09/does-security-exist-outside-of-the-speech-act/ (Accessed: 26 April 2013).

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1989a) *Fourth generation evaluation*. United States: Sage Publications.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1989b) *Fourth generation evaluation*. United States: Sage Publications.

Guzzini, S. (2006) 'Applying Bourdieu's framework of power analysis to IR: opportunities and limits', UACES. .

Hamati-Ataya, I. (2012) 'IR theory as international practice/agency: A clinical-cynical Bourdieusian perspective', *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 40(3), pp. 625–646. doi: 10.1177/0305829812442234.

Hansen, R. (2003) 'Migration to Europe since 1945: Its history and its lessons', *The Political Quarterly*, 74(s1), pp. 25–38. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-923x.2003.00579.x.

Harzig, C., Hoerder, D. and Gabaccia, D. (2009) *What is migration history?* Cambridge, UK: Wiley, John & Sons.

Headley, John M, (2008), The Europeanization of the World: On the Origins of Human Rights and Democracy. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Heckmann, F., Honekopp, E. and Currle, E. (2008) 'Guest Worker Programs and Circular Migration: What Works?', *Immigration Paper Series 09*, .

Henry, Z. (1985) 'The New Commonwealth Migrants', *History Today*, 35(12).

Hintjens, H. (2019), Failed Securitisation Moves during the 2015 'Migration Crisis'. Int Migr, 57: 181-196. doi:10.1111/imig.12588

Hobbes, T. (1953) *Leviathan*. Peter Smith Pub.

Hollifield, J.F. (1992) 'Migration and international relations: Cooperation and control in the European community', *International Migration Review*, 26(2), p. 568. doi: 10.2307/2547072.

Holmes, C. (1988) *John Bull's island: Immigration and British society, 1871-1971*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holmes, C. (ed.) (1996a) *Migration in European history; Volume 1*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Holmes, C. (ed.) (1996b) *Migration in European history; Volume 2*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Home Office (2014) *Immigration Bill ECHR Memorandum*.

Hopf, Ted. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory." International Security, vol. 23, no. 1, 1998, pp. 171–200. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/2539267.

Hopkins, T.K., Wallerstein, I. and Bach, R.L. (1982) *World-systems analysis: Theory and Methodology*. 2nd edn. London, United Kingdom: Sage Publications.

Horstmann, A. 2014. Stretching the Border: Confinement, Mobility and the Refugee Public among Karen Refugees in Thailand and Burma. Journal of Borderlands Studies 29, no. 1: 47–61.

House (2006) The colonial and post-colonial dimensions of Algerian migration to France, History in Focus 11. Available at: http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Migration/articles/house.html.

House of Commons (2006) *Immigration Control - response to the Home Affairs Committee Session*. .

House of Commons (2011) *Post-Legislative Scrutiny of the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act*. .

House of Commons (2013a) *Draft Immigration Bill*.

House of Commons (2013b) *Immigration Bill - Explanatory Notes*. .

House of Commons (2013c) *Immigration Bill (Bill No 110 of 2013-14 Research Paper 13/59)*. House of Commons Library.

House of Commons (2013d) *Parliamentary Readings (House of Commons) - Immigration Bill 2014*.

House of Commons (2014a) *2014 Immigration Act (Bill) - Written Evidence 2013/2014*. .

House of Commons (2014b) *Immigration Bill - Explanatory Notes*. .

House of Commons (2014c) *Immigration Bill: Committee Stage Report SN/HA/6806*. .

House of Commons (2014d) *Notices of Amendments up to and including Monday 27th January 2014*. .

House of Lords (2014a) *Immigration Bill - Explanatory Notes on Lords Amendments*. .

House of Lords (2014b) *Ping Pong: House of Lords - Immigration Bill 2014*.

Houtum, H.V. and Pijpers, R. (2006) 'The European Union as a Gated Community: Between Security and Selective Access', in Scott, J.W. (ed.) *EU enlargement, region building and shifting borders of inclusion and exclusion*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing

Huberman, M.A., Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (2002) *The qualitative researcher's companion: Classic and contemporary readings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Andrew John Hutchison, Lynne Halley Johnston & Jeff David Breckon (2010) Using QSR-NVivo to facilitate the development of a grounded theory project: an account of a worked example, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13:4, 283-302, DOI: 10.1080/13645570902996301

Huysman, J. (1995) 'Migrants as a security problem: dangers of "securitizing" societal issues', in *Migration and European integration: The dynamics of inclusion and exclusion*. London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press,U.S., .

Huysmans, J. (2000) 'The European Union and the securitization of migration', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38(5), pp. 751–777. doi: 10.1111/1468-5965.00263.

Huysmans, J. (2006) *The politics of insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Immigration Act (1971) .

Immigration Bill (as amended in Public Bill Committee) (2014) .

Ireland, P.R. (1991) 'Facing the true "fortress Europe": Immigrant and politics in the EC', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 29(5), pp. 457–480. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5965.1991.tb00403.x.

Jackson, R.H., Sørensen, G. and Sorensen, G. (2003) *Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford University Press.

Janis, I.L.L. (1982) *Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascoes*. 2nd edn. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin (Academic).

Jenkins, R. (2002) *Pierre Bourdieu*. Revised edn. New York: Routledge.

Kaunert C & Léonard S (2012) The development of the EU asylum policy: venue-shopping in perspective, Journal of European Public Policy, 19:9, 1396-1413, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2012.677191

Kaunert, C & Yakubov, I 2017, Securitization: Turning an approach into a framework for research on EU justice and home affairs. in The Routledge Handbook of Justice and Home Affairs Research. Taylor & Francis, pp. 30-40

Koikkalainen, S. (2014) *Free movement in Europe: Past and present*. Available at: http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/free-movement-europe-past-and-present (Accessed: 29 September 2016).

Léa Lemaire (2018) The European Dispositif of Border Control in Malta. Migrants' Experiences of a Securitized Borderland, Journal of Borderlands Studies, DOI: 10.1080/08865655.2018.1457973

Lavenex, S. (2006) 'Shifting up and out: The foreign policy of European immigration control', *West European Politics*, 29(2), pp. 329–350. doi: 10.1080/01402380500512684.

Lavenex, S. and Schimmelfennig, F. (2009) 'EU rules beyond EU borders: Theorizing external governance in European politics', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16(6), pp. 791–812. doi: 10.1080/13501760903087696.

Leander, A. (2006) *The 'Realpolitik of reason': Thinking international relations through fields, Habitus and practice*. Available at: http://openarchive.cbs.dk/bitstream/handle/10398/6970/fihp_working_paper.pdf?sequence=1 (Accessed: 15 March 2014).

Leander, A. (2011) 'The promises, problems, and potentials of a Bourdieu-Inspired staging of international relations1', *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), pp. 294–313. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-5687.2011.00135.x.

Leitner, H. (1995) 'International migration and the politics of admission and exclusion in postwar Europe', *Political Geography*, 14(3), pp. 259–278. doi: 10.1016/0962-6298(95)93187-n.

Leitner, H. (1997) 'Reconfiguring the spatiality of power: The construction of a supranational migration framework for the European Union', *Political Geography*, 16(2), pp. 123–143. doi: 10.1016/s0962-6298(96)00047-9.

Linder, W. (2011). Europe and Switzerland: Europeanization without EU membership. In Trampusch, C. and A. Mach (eds.), *Switzerland in Europe: Continuity and Change in the Swiss Political Economy*. New York: Routledge (43–59)

Lindstrom, C. (2005) 'European Union policy on asylum and immigration. Addressing the root causes of forced migration: A justice and home affairs policy of freedom, security and justice?', *Social Policy and Administration*, 39(6), pp. 587–605. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9515.2005.00458.x.

London School of Economics (2015) *Eurosceptics at a junction: Antagonising the EU for the sake of it is risky*. Available at: http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/eurocrisispress/2015/05/18/eurosceptics-at-a-junction-antagonising-the-eu-for-the-sake-of-it-is-risky/ (Accessed: 2 December 2015).

Léonard, S. (2010) 'EU border security and migration into the European Union: FRONTEX and securitisation through practices', *European Security*, 19(2), pp. 231–254. doi: 10.1080/09662839.2010.526937.

Léonard, S., Kaunert, C. (2019). Refugees, Security and the European Union. London: Routledge, https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429025976

Marsh, D. (2001), *Changing Patterns of Government: Reinventing Whitehall?,* Palgrave Macmillan

Martin, M.T. (1999) '"Fortress Europe" and Third world immigration in the post-cold war global context', *Third World Quarterly*, 20(4), pp. 821–837. doi: 10.1080/01436599913578.

Martin, P. (2006) 'Managing Labout Migration: Temporary Worker Programmes for the 21st Century', Turin, Italy: United Nations. .

Maxwell, J. (2008) 'Designing a Qualitative Study', in Bickman, L.B. and Rog, D.J. (eds.) *The sage handbook of applied social research methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, .

McCourt, D. M. (2011). Rethinking Britain's Role in the World for a New Decade: The Limits of Discursive Therapy and the Promise of Field Theory. The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 13(2), 145–164. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2010.00429.x

McDonald, M. (2008) 'Securitization and the construction of security', *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(4), pp. 563–587. doi: 10.1177/1354066108097553.

Migration Advisory Committee (2012) *Analysis of the Impacts of Migration*. .

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, M.A. (1984) *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. 9th edn. United States: Sage Publications.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, M.A. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miles, R. and Thranhardt, D. (eds.) (1995) *Migration and integration: The dynamics of inclusion and exclusion*. London: Frances Pinter Publishers.

Mitchell, C. (1989) 'International migration, international relations and foreign policy', *International Migration Review*, 23(3), p. 681. doi: 10.2307/2546435.

Moses, J.W.W. and Knutsen, T.L. (2012) *Ways of knowing: Competing methodologies and methods in social and political research*. 2nd edn. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

(2002) *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* .

Neal, A.W. (2009) 'Securitization and risk at the EU border: The origins of FRONTEX', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 47(2), pp. 333–356. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5965.2009.00807.x.

O'Dowd, L., Anderson, J. and Wilson, T.M. (eds.) (2003a) *New borders for a changing Europe (the Cass series in regional and federal studies): Cross-border cooperation and governance*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.

O'Dowd, L., Anderson, J. and Wilson, T.M. (eds.) (2003b) *New borders for a changing Europe (the Cass series in regional and federal studies): Cross-border cooperation and governance*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.

O'Dowd, L., Anderson, J. and Wilson, T.M. (eds.) (2003c) *New borders for a changing Europe (the Cass series in regional and federal studies): Cross-border cooperation and governance*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.

O'Neill, P.E. (2006) 'The European Union and migration: Security versus identity?', *Defence Studies*, 6(3), pp. 322–350. doi: 10.1080/14702430601060149.

Onuf, N. G. (1989). World of our making: rules and rule in social theory and international relations. Columbia, S.C., University of South Carolina Press.

Panayi, P. (2010) *An immigration history of Britain: Multicultural racism since 1800*. Harlow, England: Longman Pub. Group.

Papastavridis, E. (2010) '"Fortress Europe" and FRONTEX: Within or without international law?', *Nordic Journal of International Law*, 79(1), pp. 75–111. doi: 10.1163/157181009x12581245929640.

Parliament adopts directive on return of illegal immigrants (no date) Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+IM-PRESS+20080616IPR31785+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN (Accessed: 24 September 2015).

Public Bill Committee (2013a) *Immigration Bill - Eighth Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013b) *Immigration Bill - Fifth Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013c) *Immigration Bill - First Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013d) *Immigration Bill - Fourth Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013e) *Immigration Bill - Ninth Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013f) *Immigration Bill - Second Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013g) *Immigration Bill - Seventh Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013h) *Immigration Bill - Tenth Sitting*. .

Public Bill Committee (2013i) *Immigration Bill - Third Sitting*. .

Public Bills Committee (2013) *Immigration Bill - Sixth Sitting*. .

Pécoud, A., de Guchteneire, P. and UNESCO (2007) *Migration without borders: Essays on the free movement of people*. Edited by Antoine Pecoud. Paris: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural.

Redington, F.M. and Clarke, A.D. (1949) *The Papers of the Royal Commission on Population*. .

Rees, T. (1993) 'United Kingdom I: Inheriting Empire's People', in Kubat, D. (ed.) *The Politics of Migration Policies: Settlement and Integration The First World War Into the 1990's*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, .

Richards, L. (2009a) *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. London: SAGE Publications.

Richards, L. (2009b) *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. London: SAGE Publications.

Richards, L. and Morse, J. (2013) *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.

Riker, W.H. (1986) *The art of political manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rothschild, Emma (1995). What is Security?, Daedalus, Vol. 124, No. 3, The Quest for World Order (Summer, 1995), pp. 53-98

Rudolph, H. (1994) in Fassman, H. (ed.) *European migration in the late twentieth century: Historical patterns, actual trends, and social implications*. Aldershot: Elgar, Edward Publishing, .

Ruiz, O. (2006) 'Migration and borders: Present and future challenges', *Latin American Perspectives*, 33(2), pp. 46–55. doi: 10.1177/0094582x05286084.

Saldaña, J. (2009) *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Sassen, S. (1999) *Guests and aliens*. New York: The New Press.

Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. United States: Princeton University Press.

Selm, J. van (2005) 'Immigration and Regional Seurity', in Guild, E. and Selm, J. van (eds.) *International Migration and Security*. London: Routledge, pp. 11–27.

Semetko, H. and Valkenburg, P. (2000) 'Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news', *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), pp. 93–109. doi: 10.1093/joc/50.2.93.

Starr, H. and Most, B.A. (1976) 'The substance and study of borders in international relations research', *International Studies Quarterly*, 20(4), p. 581. doi: 10.2307/2600341.

Stevens, D., Banducci, S., Karp, J. and Vowles, J. (2011) 'Priming time for Blair? Media priming, Iraq, and leadership evaluations in Britain', *Electoral Studies*, 30(3), pp. 546–560. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2011.04.001.

Strauss, A.L. (1987) *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Straw, J. (1998) *Fairer, Faster, and Firmer - A modern approach to Immigration and Asylum*. UK Government.

Somerville, Will. (2007). Immigration under New Labour. Bristol : Policy

Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C.B. (1998) *Mixed methodology Vol. 46: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

The Treaty Establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (1951) .

The Treaty Establishing the European Coal and Steel Community and Annexes I-III (1951) .

The Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) .

The Treaty of Rome (1957) .

Travis, A. (2016) *'Go home' vans resulted in 11 people leaving Britain, says report*. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/oct/31/go-home-vans-11-leave-britain (Accessed: 24 September 2015).

(1905) *Aliens Act* .

(1962) *Commonwealth Immigrants Act* .

(1988) *Immigration Act* .

(1993) *Asylum and Immigrations Appeal Act* .

UK Government (2004) *The government reply to the report from the Home Affairs Committee Session 2003-04 HC 109 Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claiments) Bill*. .

UK Government (2007) *Highly Skilled Migrants: Changes to the Immigration Rules*. .

(2011) *Le Touquet Treaty* .

UK Government (2014a) *Agreement between the Government of the UK of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium, Concerning Immigration controls on Rail Traffic between Belgium and the UK using the Channel Fixed Link*. .

UK Government (2014b) *Final Immigration Act versus Immigration Bill (as amended in Public Committee)*. .

UK Government (2014c) *Immigration Bill Factsheet: Article 8 (Clause 14)*. .

UK Government (2014d) *Section 94b (Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002) certification guidance for non EEA deportation cases*. .

UK Home Office (2014a) *Country Information and Guidance Egypt: Christians*. .

UK Home Office (2014b) *Home Office Asylum Policy Instruction - EEA/EU Asylum Claims Version 2*. UK Home Office.

UK Parliament (1905) *SECOND READING*. Available at: http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1905/jul/28/second-reading#S4V0150P0_19050728_HOL_40 (Accessed: 19 September 2016).

UNHCR note on the principle of Non-Refoulement (2016) Available at: http://www.refworld.org/docid/438c6d972.html (Accessed: 27 September 2016).

Vollmer, B. (2014) Policy Discourses on Irregular Migration in Germany and the United Kingdom, London: Palgrave Macmillan

Wacquant, L. (ed.) (2005) *Pierre Bourdieu and democratic politics: The mystery of ministry; Ed. By Loic Wacquant*. Cambridge: Wiley, John & Sons.

Wallerstein, I. (2004) *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. 5th edn. Durham: Duke University Press Books.

Waltz, K.N.N. (1979) *Theory of international politics*. New York: Random House USA.

Weaver, O. (1995) 'Securitization and Deseciritization', in Lipschutz (ed.) *On Security*. Columbia University Press, pp. 46–86.

Webb, J., Schirato, T. and Danaher, G. (2002) *Understanding Bourdieu*. London: SAGE Publications.

Weiner, M. (1985) 'On international migration and international relations', *Population and Development Review*, 11(3), p. 441. doi: 10.2307/1973247.

de Wenden, C.W. (1994) 'Immigrants as political actors in France', *West European Politics*, 17(2), pp. 91–109. doi: 10.1080/01402389408425016.

Wendt, A. (1992) 'Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics', *International Organization*, 46(02), p. 391. doi: 10.1017/s0020818300027764.

Wendt, A.E. (1987) 'The agent-structure problem in international relations theory', *International Organization*, 41(03), p. 335. doi: 10.1017/s002081830002751x.

Wendt, A.E. (1998) On Constitution and Causation in International Relations, Review of International Studies, Vol. 24, The Eighty Years' Crisis 1919-1999 (Dec.,1998), pp. 101-117, Cambridge University Press

Williams, M.C. (2003) 'Words, images, enemies: Securitization and international politics', *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(4), pp. 511–531. doi: 10.1046/j.0020-8833.2003.00277.x.

Winder, R. (2004) *Bloody foreigners: The story of immigration to Britain*. London: Little, Brown & Company.

Wolcott, H.F. (1994) *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. 4th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wæver, O. and Carlton, D. (1993) *Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter.

Zincone, G., Penninx, R. and Borkert, M. (eds.) (2011) *Migration policymaking in Europe: The dynamics of actors and contexts in past and present*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.